



**LIBRARY**  
OF THE  
Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

*Case,*.....

*Shelf,*.....

*Book,*.....

5-27-11  
57  
11  
11









A

# COMMENTARY

ON THE

## EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.

---

BY MOSES STUART

Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Andover.

---

VOL. I.

---

ANDOVER :

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY MARK NEWMAN.

Codman press....Flagg & Gould.

1827.

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, to wit :

*District Clerk's Office.*

Be it remembered, that on the 18th day of September, A. D. 1827, and in the fifty second year of the Independence of the United States of America, Moses Stuart, of the said district, has deposited in this Office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as author, in the words following, *to wit* : " A Commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews. In two volumes. By Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Andover." In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, " An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;" and also to an act entitled, " An act supplementary to an act, entitled, An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints."

JOHN W. DAVIS { *Clerk of the District*  
                          { *of Massachusetts.*



## PREFACE.

---

THE origin of the following work must be ascribed to the duties, which my present occupation calls upon me to perform. As the time spent in the study of the Scriptures, at this Seminary, has not allowed me to lecture upon all the epistles of Paul, it has been my custom to select those, which appeared to be the most difficult, and in some respects the most instructive and important. These are the epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. In respect to the latter epistle, many serious exegetical difficulties occur, to remove which, much time and extensive study are necessary. But the greatest difficulty of all arises from the fact, that this epistle is anonymous, and that the Pauline origin of it has been more or less doubted or disputed, every since the latter part of the second century, if not still earlier. This subject I have deemed to be very interesting and important; and I have endeavoured, while discharging my duty of lecturing upon the epistle, to throw what light I could upon the dark places of its literature.

Experience however has taught me, that lectures could communicate to students but a very limited and incompetent view of the disputed ground, in regard to the origin of the epistle to the Hebrews. The exceedingly numerous quotations, and appeals to writers ancient and modern, which it was necessary to make, and the almost endless references to the Scriptures, which apposite illustration and argument required, rendered it impossible that a mere lecturer should communicate, or his hearer acquire and retain, any thing like an adequate view of the whole subject.

What was true of the literary introduction to the epistle, was also found to be true, in respect to many of the most important exegetical difficulties, connected with the interpretation of it. The young student, by the mere repetition or delivery of any lecture upon them, (however particular or plain it might be in view of an

experienced interpreter), was not able to acquire such a knowledge as would avail thoroughly to free him from his embarrassments, or to render him capable of explaining such matters to others.

The knowledge of these facts, resulting from repeated experience, first led me to the design of publishing *in extenso*, on the epistle to the Hebrews. The repeated solicitations which have been made, that I would engage in this undertaking, might perhaps constitute some apology for embarking in it, if such an apology were necessary. But the time has come, when, in our country, no apology is necessary for an effort to promote the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, or to cast any light upon them. There is an apprehension, at present, somewhat extensive and continually increasing, that no one age, nor any body of men pertaining to it, have done *all* which the human faculties, with the blessing of God, are capable of accomplishing. Christians, in this country, are coming more and more to believe, that as the church advances nearer to that state, in which "the knowledge of the Lord shall fill the earth as the waters cover the seas," a better understanding of the Scriptures may be confidently hoped for and expected. It cannot be rationally supposed, that this will be communicated by a miraculous interposition. It must result from candid, patient, long continued, and radical investigation of the language and idiom of the Sacred writers. Interpretations *a priori* have long enough had their sway in the church; and it is very manifest, that a more judicious and truly Protestant mode of thinking and reasoning, in respect to the interpretation of the Scriptures, has commenced, and bids fair to be extensively adopted.

Whether the following sheets will contribute to aid this great object, must be left to the readers of them to decide. I can only say, that I have aimed at the accomplishment of this end, and that, if I have failed in respect to it, one great design of my undertaking and labours is defeated.

Probably some of my readers may think, that the *introductory* dissertations, which constitute the first volume of the present work, are more extended than was necessary, and that they are too minute and circumstantial. My only reply to this is, that an acquaintance with what has of late years been done, and with what is now doing, to shake the credit of our epistle, and to eject it from the canon of sacred writings to which appeal can be made in proof of

Scripture doctrine, would of itself be an ample apology for all the pains I have taken, and all the minuteness of examination into which I have gone. Should it be said, that the German writers, whom I have opposed, are as yet unknown in this country, and that it was inexpedient to make them known; the allegation would only shew how little acquainted the person who makes it is, with the actual state of our present knowledge, and with the relations in which we stand to the German authors. Our youth are every day resorting to Germany for education; our colleges are filling up with Professors, who have been educated there; the language of Germany is becoming an object of classical study in our public Seminaries of learning; and in a multitude of ways, through the medium of translations as well as by the knowledge of the German language, is the literature of Germany producing an influence upon our own.

In this state of things, the attacks made upon the Pauline origin, or upon the canonical credit, of the epistle to the Hebrews, cannot be kept back from the knowledge of our intelligent and industrious students. It is better, therefore, to meet the whole matter with an open face, fairly to examine it, and either to yield to the force of arguments suggested by the critics of the old world, or to combat them in such a way as effectually to defend the positions which we take. Christian candour and impartiality demand this. The day of *authority* in the church is passed by; it is to be hoped, that the day of *sound reason* and of *argument*, is to follow. It is better to convince men by an appeal to their understandings and their hearts, than it is to terrify them by holding the rod of authority over them, or to deter them from speaking out their convictions by arguments *ad invidiam*. These are the never failing resource of minds, which are conscious of possessing no better means than such of convincing others, and which naturally resort to those which are most within their reach.

Our religion seeks no concealment; it fears no assaults. If it will not stand the test of sober reason and of argument, it will not long have place in the world, among enlightened men. Those who shrink from such tests, and declaim against the use of our reason, shew their want of confidence in the cause which they profess to espouse. If they did but know it, they are already half won over, to the ranks of doubters or of unbelievers.

On the subject of interpretation, one may well say, "Drink

deep, or taste not." A half illuminated interpreter doubts every thing, and sees nothing clearly. Would God, the rising generation of those who are devoted to the study of the divine word, might feel deeply penetrated with the truth of this! It would be an event, highly auspicious to the cause of truth in the world.

The second volume of this work, will commence with a new translation of the epistle to the Hebrews. In this, it has been my object to give a more exact view of the features of the original Greek, than is presented by our common English version. Of all the tasks which an interpreter performs, this is the most difficult. To make some kind of translation, is indeed a very easy thing; to follow on, in the tracks of some other interpreter, is equally easy. But to translate, so as to make an author, who has composed in another language, altogether intelligible, and yet preserve all the shades, and colouring, and nice transitions, and (so far as may be) even the idioms themselves of the Original, is the very highest and most difficult work, which an interpreter is ever called to perform. A translation, faithfully presenting the original, is in itself a commentary. It is the sum of all an interpreter's labours, exhibited in the briefest manner possible. Hence the little success, that has attended most of the versions which have been made of the Scriptures. Their authors have either abridged or paraphrased the original; more commonly, the latter. Neither is admissible, in a translation truly faithful. Whether I have shunned the one and the other, must be left to the judgment of the reader.

I much prefer the Saxon English, for a version of the Bible. I have accordingly chosen it, whenever I could, and have purposely avoided substituting Latinizing English in its room, unless a regard to the meaning of the original compelled me to do it.

The translation will be followed, by a continuous commentary upon the whole epistle. When difficulties demanded special and extended investigation, I have thrown the result of such investigation into an *Excursus* at the end. There, subjects of difficulty can be treated, and studied, with more convenience and more fully, than if intermixed with the usual series of exegetical notes.

I have consulted commentaries both ancient and modern, while composing the exegetical part of these volumes. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, are the ancient interpreters, who may be read with much interest, and with some profit. I owe to them

not a few hints, which I regard as valuable. From more recent critics I have derived very considerable aid, which I would gratefully acknowledge. After all, I have examined other writers, rather for the sake of correcting or enlarging my own impressions, than for the sake of abridging or condensing their works. My uniform method of study has been, to exhaust the resources of my own mind before I applied to others for help. But I have neither despised nor neglected this help; nor have I, in any case, followed the opinion of any critic, unless I was satisfied with the reasons which he gives for it. Critics of very different sentiments and views, I have consulted. Impartial investigation demanded this; and I should be illy satisfied, in respect to the discharge of my own duty, if I had not done it.

The interpretations which I have adopted and defended, are the result of long continued and often repeated labour and study. This, however, does not of itself enhance their value to the reader. They must stand by their own internal value, if they do stand, and not by the length of time during which they have been coming into existence.

I have not made it an object to transcribe other commentators, and continually to refer to them. It is a mode of commentary to which I have a dislike; particularly so, when it is carried to the excess, to which many interpreters have carried it. I have therefore retreated as far from it, as my views of usefulness and propriety would permit me to do. The reader will have, at least, one advantage from this. He will not be compelled merely *agere actum*—to read over what he has read before.

To say, that *critical* commentaries on the Scriptures, of the higher kind, are wanting in the English language, would be only to repeat what every biblical student has long felt and confessed. The time has come, when this evil ought, if possible, to be redressed. Whether the attempt to assist in this great work, which I have made in the following sheets, can be justly regarded as a successful one, is not for the writer to judge.

It will be understood, of course, that the work is designed for students in theology, and for those who engage in a truly critical study of the Scriptures. With commentaries designed for the edification of Christian readers at large, I believe the English world is better supplied, than any other part of Christendom. Henry,

---

Patrick, Guise, Orton, Doddridge, Brown, Clark, Scott, and others, have published works of this nature. It is not my design to occupy the ground, which they have already occupied. The reader of my work must not expect sermonizing commentary, but an attempt at philological and critical interpretation. *Cuique suum*. I bless God for raising up such commentators as those just mentioned, for Christians at large ; but the *professed interpreters* of his word need other aid, and that very different from what their works afford, in order to attain a fundamentally critical knowledge of the original Scriptures.

The responsibility of publishing a work like the present, is very great. It is one from which I should shrink, if, on the whole, I could come to the conclusion, that duty would permit me to decline it. As my conviction now is, I must venture to commit the work to God, and to the Christian public, hoping that it may contribute, in some measure, to advance the knowledge of a very interesting portion of his Holy Word.

M. STUART.

Theological Seminary, Andover,  
Sept. 18, 1827.

## CONTENTS.

---

Sect.	Page.
1. Preliminary remarks . . . . .	1
2. Is the epistle to the Hebrews appropriately called an <i>epistle</i> , or is it a homily or essay? . . . . .	4
3. General considerations respecting the present inscription to the epistle . . . . .	8
4. To what church was the epistle to the Hebrews written? . . . . .	9
5. Was the epistle written to the church in Galatia? . . . . .	10
6. Was the epistle directed to the church at Thessalonica? . . . . .	25
7. Was it directed to Hebrews, who were sojourners in Asia Minor? . . . . .	31
8. Was the epistle addressed to the church at Corinth? . . . . .	32
9. Was the epistle sent to Spain, or to Rome? . . . . .	37
10. Was it written to the church in Palestine? . . . . .	37
11. Was it directed to all the churches in Palestine? Or only to one of them? and if so, to which? . . . . .	68
12. Antiquity and canonical authority of the epistle . . . . .	74
13. Was Paul the author of the epistle to the Hebrews? . . . . .	90
14. Testimony of the Alexandrian church . . . . .	92
15. Testimony of the eastern churches . . . . .	112
16. Testimony of the western churches . . . . .	118
17. RESULT . . . . .	129
18. Internal evidence that the epistle is Paul's . . . . .	132
19. Evidence that it is Paul's, from circumstances mentioned in the epistle . . . . .	132
20. Evidence that it is Paul's, from a similarity of sentiment; and also from the form, method, style, and diction of the composition . . . . .	141

Sect.	Page.
21. Similarity of doctrines, between the epistle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epistles of Paul . . . . .	142
22. Form and method of the epistle to the Hebrews, compared with those of Paul's acknowledged epistles . . . . .	152
23. Comparison of the phraseology and diction of the epistle to the Hebrews, and of the acknowledged epistles of Paul . . . . .	160
24. Remarks on the comparisons made in the preceding sections . . . . .	168
25. Objections . . . . .	173
26. Objections by Bertholdt considered . . . . .	174
27. Objections by Schulz considered . . . . .	194
28. Objections by Seyffarth examined . . . . .	232
29. Nature of objections put to the test . . . . .	241
30. Objections by De Wette . . . . .	253
31. Objections by Boehme . . . . .	258
32. Hebraisms of the epistle . . . . .	260
33. Alexandrine hue of the epistle . . . . .	267
34. RESULT . . . . .	271
35. Was Barnabas the author? . . . . .	272
36. Was Luke the author? . . . . .	275
37. Was Clement of Rome the author? . . . . .	276
38. Was Apollos the author? . . . . .	278
39. In what language was the epistle originally written? . . . . .	278
40. Critical and exegetical helps to the study of the epistle . . . . .	285



**PART I.**



## INTRODUCTION.

---

### § 1. *Preliminary Remarks.*

No part of the New Testament has occasioned so much difference of opinion, and given rise to so much literary discussion among critics, as the Epistle to the Hebrews. The principal reason of this seems to be, that this epistle does not exhibit, either in the beginning of it or elsewhere, any express evidence of having been addressed to any particular church, nor any designation of the author's name. If it had been expressly inscribed to a particular church, and if the author had originally affixed his name to it, there would of course have been as little occasion for dispute, respecting the persons to whom it was addressed, or in regard to the author of it, as there has been in the case of the epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, or Galatians.

At an early period of the Christian era, the eastern and western churches were divided in opinion respecting the author and canonical authority of this epistle. In modern times, and especially of late, every topic which its literary history could suggest, has been the subject of animated discussion. It has been disputed whether it is an epistle, an essay, or a homily; whether it was written by Paul, Apollos, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, or by some other person; and whether it was originally written in Hebrew or in Greek. There has also been a difference of opinion as to the place where, and the time when, it was written. On every one of these topics, critics have been and still are divided. Nor has this division been occasioned merely by a difference in theological opinions. The subjects of dispute have, in this case, been generally regarded rather as topics of *literature*, than of re-

ligious sentiment or doctrine. Men of very different views and feelings, in other respects, have often been found united in the same ranks, when questions respecting the epistle to the Hebrews have been disputed. Such too is the case, even at the present time. All the learning and ability, which have as yet been summoned to the contest, have failed to achieve a victory so complete, as to bring about a general acknowledgment that all ground for further dispute is fairly removed.

The student, who is unacquainted with these facts, and who has merely read the epistle to the Hebrews with the same views and feelings which he has entertained while reading the *acknowledged* epistles of Paul, finds himself thrown into a situation not a little perplexing, when he begins to make such critical inquiries respecting the epistle in question, as are usually made respecting any ancient writing. He finds philologists and critics of great reputation in the church strangely divided and opposed to each other, in respect to every topic to be examined. What he reads in one author, which perhaps for a time satisfies his mind, he finds controverted, shaken, or overthrown by another; who again, in his turn, receives castigation from a third; while a fourth, a fifth, and a sixth, differ each from all his predecessors. The curiosity of the inquirer thus becomes roused, and he begins to pursue some train of thought or investigation, with the hope, or perhaps with confidence, that it will lead him to an important and satisfactory result. He presses forward with eagerness, peruses and reperuses modern critics, dives into the recesses of the ancient ones, and finds, perhaps, after all his toil, that he has been pursuing a phantom, which recedes as fast as he advances. Perplexed with doubt, and wearied at last with the pursuit, he becomes exposed to the danger of entirely abandoning his object, or of settling down in the cold and comfortless conclusion, that nothing satisfactory can be known in regard to it.

Such, or not much unlike to this, will be the experience, I believe, of nearly every one who sets out with his mind unfettered by any notions of early education, and determined seriously and thoroughly to investigate and weigh for himself all the evidence which can be found, in respect to the topics suggested by

the literary history of the epistle to the Hebrews. He who begins such an investigation, with his mind already made up that Paul wrote this epistle and directed it to the Hebrews of Palestine, may indeed spare himself most of the perplexity, in which an inquirer of the class just named will be involved. But then if his mind is already made up, what need is there of further investigation? And why not spare himself the time and trouble which it must cost?

Minds of a different order, however, will doubtless wish to examine for themselves; to "prove all things," and then "to hold fast that which is good," if indeed they may be able to distinguish what is of this character. It is for such, that the following investigations are intended; and it is only to persons of this class, that they can be particularly useful, even supposing that they are conducted in such a manner as the subject demands. The writer commenced them, in the discharge of his duty as a lecturer upon the epistle in question. He found many unforeseen and unexpected obstacles in his path. He had been accustomed, with those around him, to regard Paul as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; and he did not well know, until he came to examine, how long, and how extensively this had been doubted. Men of high reputation in the church, and who admitted the canonical authority of the epistle, he found to have been doubtful in regard to the question, Who was the author of it. Neither Luther, nor Calvin admitted it to be from the hand of Paul; and so early, at least, as the latter part of the second century, more or less of the Western churches, seem to have disputed or rejected its authority.

With such facts before him, he became deeply interested in the subject, and resolved, if possible, to satisfy his own mind. For this purpose, he directed his attention principally toward the original sources of evidence, although he has not neglected any writer of importance among modern critics. The results of his investigation he now gives to the public, in hope that if they do not serve to satisfy the minds of others, they will, at least, excite some to engage in the discussion of the topics presented, until sooner or later light enough is poured in, to scatter the remaining darkness which rests upon them.

§ 2. *Is the epistle to the Hebrews appropriately called an epistle, or is it a homily or essay ?*

Berger, a late critic of some eminence and considerable acuteness, has advanced and endeavoured to support the opinion, that this epistle (so called) was originally a homily or address to some assembly of Christians, which was afterwards reduced to writing by some of the preacher's friends or hearers. Others also have doubted, whether it is properly named an epistle. But none have argued on this topic so much at length, or with so much effort, as Berger. On this account, it may be proper briefly to consider the principal arguments which he has advanced; *briefly*, because the topic seems not to be of sufficient importance to justify one for occupying much time in the discussion of it.

(1.) 'The writer himself of the epistle to the Hebrews,' says Berger, 'calls it *λόγον παρακλήσεως*, a *hortatory address* 13: 22, which accords well with the contents of the piece.'

But Paul, one may reply, often uses the word *παρακαλέω* in his *epistles*. May not, then, an epistle of his in which *παρακαλέω* is used, be appropriately enough styled a *λόγος παρακλήσεως*? May not any epistle, containing precept and exhortation, be so denominated? An instance exactly in point, is the circular letter respecting the question about circumcision, sent by the apostolic council at Jerusalem to the churches in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia; which is called a *παράκλησις*, Acts 15: 31. The words of Luke are, "When they had read [the epistle,] they rejoiced ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει."

(2.) 'The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews uses *λαλεῖν* instead of *γοῶσθαι*; which is rather characteristic of a *hortatory address* than of an *epistle*.'

But an appeal to the Greek Concordance shews that *λαλεῖν* is used every where in the epistles contained in the New Testament; and a corresponding word of the same import, is in fact used in the epistolary style of all nations and languages. No evidence therefore in favour of Berger's opinion, can be deduced from such an usage in the epistle to the Hebrews.

(3.) Berger supposes the basis of our present epistle to the

Hebrews to have been the address of Paul to the church at Antioch in Pisidia, as recorded in Acts 13: 14—41. Some disciple and friend of his, he conjectures, reduced this discourse to writing, commenting or enlarging upon various parts of it; and finally adding of himself, to the original discourse, the four last verses of our present epistle. It is to these four verses he supposes the copyist to refer, when he says, “I have written to you *διὰ βραχέων*, *briefly*,” viz. by adding only the four last verses of the epistle, as properly his own.

To these considerations we may reply, first, that the address of Paul to the church at Antioch in Pisidia exhibits two very important topics, as prominent parts of the discourse, which are not at all commented on (one of them is not even adverted to) in the epistle to the Hebrews; I mean the subject of John the Baptist’s testimony concerning Christ, and the resurrection of Jesus, Acts 13: 24, 25, 30—37. Would it not be strange, that a commentator should entirely pass by the prominent topics of the discourse, which he designed to explain or to enforce ?

Secondly, *διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν* does not admit of the reference which Berger supposes; for it is necessarily connected with the *preceding* part of the epistle to the Hebrews, and not (as he asserts) with the *succeeding* part; to which it can be attached only by doing violence to the ordinary laws of language.

(4.) ‘The word *ἀμήν*, in Heb. 13: 21, shows that the *original* discourse ended there, and that what follows is only an addition made by the transcriber.’

The answer is, that *ἀμήν* here stands after a *doxology*, where Paul always inserts it; and he frequently introduces it in this way in the very middle of his letters. E. g. Rom. 1: 25. 9: 5. 11: 36. 15: 33. 16: 20. Gal. 1: 5. Eph. 3: 21. etc. It follows, that in this case, the insertion of *ἀμήν* cannot afford any valid proof that our epistle ended with it.

(5.) ‘The whole epistle is a regular series of reasoning, a connected chain of discourse; like to an essay or a homily, and not after the manner of a familiar letter.’

But, it may well be asked in reply to this, may not and do not men reason, and regularly discuss subjects, in familiar letters or

epistles? Has not Paul discussed and reasoned in the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, the Ephesians, and in others? Is there any more regularity of structure in the epistle to the Hebrews, than there is in that to the Romans? Surely the regularity and orderly discussion, exhibited by any composition, can never prove that this composition was not an epistle. At most, it can only serve to shew that it was not an *ordinary* epistle on topics of little moment. Nor because a great part, or even the whole, of an epistle is of such a tenor, that it might have been *spoken* as an *address* or a *homily*, will it prove that it was not originally, or was not designed to be, an epistle. For every species of composition in use among men, is employed in epistolary writing.

The reasons of Berger, then, for the opinion which he has advanced, will not bear the test of examination. I may add, that the whole question is but little if any thing better than logomachy. Of what consequence can it be, whether the so called epistle to the Hebrews, was, in its first conception, designed to be an epistle or a homily? But whatever the original design was, I cannot believe, with Berger, that our epistle is a kind of commentary on an original discourse of Paul. That the author (the original author) of the epistle wrote down his own conceptions, or at least *dictated* them to an amanuensis, appears to me so deeply stamped on every part of the composition, that it seems hardly possible for a discerning and unprejudiced reader not to perceive it. But whether or not the author first spoke the words which the letter contains to some assembly, and afterwards reduced them to writing, can make no difference as to the tenor and general character of the epistle; so that dispute about this would be only dispute about the *name* to be given to the writing; and how would this differ from logomachy?

However, if this must be disputed, we can easily satisfy ourselves respecting it. The address every where is like that of an epistle, viz. in the second person plural; with the single exception, that the writer occasionally uses a *κοινωνίαις*, that is, he includes himself with those whom he addresses, and so employs the *first person plural*. But this is a practice so common in epistolary



correspondence, that it occasions no difficulty in the case under consideration.

It is true, the mode of address would be the same in regard to the particular just noticed, if the epistle had originally been a homily. But other particulars render such a supposition utterly inadmissible. The epistle every where supposes the persons addressed to be *absent* from the writer, not present before him, as in the case of a homily. How could he, in a *homily*, ask them to “pray that he might be *restored to them*?” Heb. 13: 19. How could he promise to ‘*make them a visit*, in company with Timothy, if he should come speedily?’ 13: 23. The first of these cases, at least, belongs to that part of the epistle, which Berger acknowledges to be the *original* discourse of Paul.

I add, that I am unable to see how any one can well imagine, (as Berger does, and as Origen long ago conjectured), that the hand of a *commentator* is discernible in this epistle. The whole tenor of it, from beginning to end, contradicts this. Did ever any writing come more warmly and fully from the heart? Here is no patchwork; no congeries of heterogeneous materials; no designed, exegetical *commentary*; no trace of a copyist or reporter. It is one uniform, unbroken, continuous work; produced by the mighty impulse of one and the same mind, fraught with knowledge of the subject which it discusses, glowing with benevolent feelings toward those who are addressed, and agitated with alarm at the danger to which they are exposed. Sooner should I think of dividing into parcels the Iliad, the Eneid, or the Paradise Lost, and assigning respective parts to different poets, than of introducing the hand of a copyist, or a mere commentator, into the epistle to the Hebrews. Be it written where, when, or by whom it may have been, *one* mind performed the great work, and stamped it with characteristics too plain to be obscured, too deep to be erased.

§ 3. *General considerations respecting the present inscription to the Epistle.*

In what latitude is the word *Hebrews*, used in the inscription to this epistle, to be understood?

Certainly not as designating *all* Hebrews of every country. To the *unbelieving* Jews most evidently it was not addressed. From beginning to end, the persons addressed are regarded as having made a profession of the Christian faith; for the great object of the epistle, as all agree, is to guard them against apostasy from this faith.

To the believing Jews of *every* country, it could not have been primarily and immediately addressed. It is altogether improbable that *all* such, in every country, were in special danger of apostasy, when this letter was written. We know from the epistles of Paul, that many churches planted by him, and made up in part of Jews, were, at the period when our epistle must have been written, in a very flourishing condition, and eminent for Christian faith and holiness of life. Other circumstances mentioned in the epistle, and pertaining to those whom he addressed, cannot be applied to *all* the believing Hebrews of that period. The writer speaks of the great fight of afflictions and the loss of property, to which those had been subjected for the sake of religion whom he addresses, 10: 32—34; occurrences which surely had not taken place, in *every* church where Jews were found.

A still more convincing argument, in favour of the sentiment just advanced, is drawn from what the writer himself has stated, at the close of his letter. He asks the prayers of those whom he addresses, that he may be speedily restored to them, 13: 19; and promises, if Timothy return in a short time, that he will in his company pay them a visit, 13: 23. He could not mean that he would, in company with Timothy, visit *all* the churches where Jews were to be found throughout the world. And could Timothy be known to them all? Or could the circumstances of Timothy, and of the writer himself, be so well known by them all, as the manner of address here necessarily supposes?

These considerations render it quite clear, that whosoever the Hebrews were that are named by the present inscription, they must have been those of some particular church and country. And even if we pay no regard to the *inscription*, (but suppose it, after some time had elapsed, to have been affixed to the epistle by another hand, as it probably was), the fact that *Jewish converts* are addressed, and such too as belonged to some *particular* church or region, is, from the internal evidence of the epistle just stated, too plain to admit of any considerable doubt.

#### § 4. *To what Church was the Epistle to the Hebrews written?*

A question replete with difficulties, and which has been much agitated by late critics. We can easily satisfy ourselves, that the epistle was designed for Jewish converts; and exclusively (in a certain sense of this word) designed for them, i. e. originally adapted to them throughout, in its texture and mode of reasoning. But *where* did these converts live? No salutation, such as stands at the head of nearly all the apostolic epistles, gives us information on this point. The conclusion of the letter, moreover, contains nothing definite enough to settle this question. We are left, then, to gather from ecclesiastical tradition and from internal evidence, such information as is necessary to determine it. But the first of these has been regarded by many critics, particularly by recent ones, as too indefinite or too imperfect to satisfy the mind of an inquirer; and the second is so indeterminate, at least it has been often considered so indeterminate, as to afford no *convincing* evidence, but rather to give occasion for constant diversity of opinion. The same passages, for example, have often been quoted, in some instances, to support conclusions directly opposed to each other; and in other cases, *definite* conclusions have been drawn in support of particular opinions, from texts which appear to be capable of conveying only a *general* idea.

The task of examining the principal opinions which have been advanced in respect to the original destination of the epistle to the Hebrews, is tedious and appalling; but it has become absolutely

necessary to every one, who makes any just pretensions to acquaintance with the literary history of this epistle. I shall be as brief as the nature of the discussion, and justice to the arguments of others, will permit; and I shall examine only those opinions which the authors of them have endeavoured to support by arguments, omitting a particular discussion of those which have been thrown out as mere conjecture. For a *mere conjecture* that the epistle was directed to Jewish converts at Rome, in Spain, or at Babylon, (such conjectures have been made by critics of no small note), is sufficiently answered by a *conjecture* that it was directed to Jewish converts at some other place. If no weight be laid in the scales, it requires none to adjust the balance.

In our investigations respecting the question under consideration, we meet with critics who have maintained, that the epistle was written to Jewish Christians in Galatia; in Thessalonica; in Corinth; or to dispersed Hebrews in Asia Minor at large, who had fled from Palestine in order to avoid the persecutions to which they were there exposed. The majority of critics however have held, as nearly all the ancient churches did, that the epistle was directed to the Hebrews of Palestine. I proceed to examine each of these opinions, in the order here suggested.

#### § 5. *Was the Epistle written to the Church at Galatia?*

The opinion, that the epistle was directed to Jewish converts in Galatia, has been advanced and maintained with no small degree of acuteness and learning by Storr, late Professor of Theology at the University of Tübingen. I shall present a summary of the arguments which he uses to establish it; and in order to avoid repetition, and also to render the discussion as perspicuous as may be, I shall examine the validity of each argument, as it is adduced.

He begins by observing, that the epistle to the Hebrews could not be directed to the church in Palestine, because it appears from Heb. 2: 3, that the persons to whom it was addressed were not such as heard Christ speak in person; from 12: 4, and 13: 7,

that they had as yet suffered no bloody persecution; and from 6: 10. 13: 3, 10, and 10: 34, that so far from having received charity from other churches, they had themselves contributed to the support of others. Now as neither of these things can, in his view, be truly said respecting the church in Palestine, he concludes that our epistle must have been directed to some church abroad.

I shall not stop here to examine, whether a proper interpretation of the passages on which he relies to support his opinion, will in fact support it, as this subject must be examined in another place. I must content myself, at present, with simply remarking, that if he has rightly construed the texts to which he refers, they only serve to shew, at most, that the church in Palestine was *not* the one to which the epistle was directed; leaving the question still untouched, whether it was sent, as he maintains, to the church in Galatia. As my present intention is to examine only *positive* arguments in favour of his opinion, I pass this consideration without further remark.

Most if not all of the arguments on which Storr relies, are grounded on what he supposes to be *probabilities*. The general nature of them may be thus stated. ‘Certain facts relative to the Galatians and the Hebrews, are known from history, and from the epistles which bear their names. But these facts cannot well be accounted for on any other ground, than by the supposition that the epistles to the Hebrews and Galatians were *contemporaneously* written, and directed *severally* to the Jewish and Gentile parts of the same church. This being admitted, several things, otherwise strange or inexplicable, may be easily accounted for; and consequently we may or must admit such a composition and direction of these epistles.’

Let us examine the particulars, which go to make up the general argument that I have just stated.

(1.) ‘As the epistle to the Hebrews was not written to the churches in Palestine, and as all the churches abroad consisted of a mixture of Jews and Gentiles, it is a singularity very striking, and at first appearance inexplicable, how it should come to pass that the epistle to the Galatians is written exclusively to Gentile converts, and the Epistle to the Hebrews exclusively to

Jewish ones. But all appearance of difficulty vanishes, if we suppose that the two epistles were sent, at the same time, to the church in Galatia; each to the respective party for whom it was intended. A supposition which removes such difficulties, must be regarded as a probable one.?

This supposition is not wanting in ingenuity; and at first view, it may be regarded as not being destitute of probability. But then, the critic must ask, How far can we be allowed to draw conclusions, in respect to subjects of this nature, from mere *conjectural* probabilities? I may conjecture thousands of circumstances, in themselves probable, which would liberate me from difficulties presented by particular passages, or by whole books of the Old Testament and the New; on which conjectures, however, it would be very uncritical and unsafe for me to build conclusions, in respect to any matter of *fact*. Even if we allow the *probability*, then, of Storr's conjecture, it cannot add much real weight to the cause which he endeavours to support.

Such a probability, however, cannot well be allowed. There are circumstances, in the epistles to the Galatians and the Hebrews, relative to the condition of the persons respectively addressed, which serve to evince that the Galatian church could not, at the *same* time, have been addressed by both of these letters. This I shall have farther occasion to show, in the sequel. In the mean time, it may suffice to remark here, that it is far from being certain, as Storr assumes it to be, that the epistle to the Galatians is addressed *exclusively* to Gentile converts. When the apostle speaks of their being "shut up under the law, before the gospel was preached;" and of "the law having been their instructor to bring them to Christ," Gal. 3: 23, 24; can those whom he thus addresses have been only *Gentiles*? And when he speaks of their "having been in a state of minority before Christ came;" of their "having been *νήπιοι*, and in bondage to the elements of the world," i. e. the ritual ceremonies of the Mosaic law, Gal. 4: 1—3; it seems to be very far from being obvious that only Gentile converts are addressed. Indeed, so plainly do these passages appear to respect Jews, that a critic of no less note than Noesselt considers it as certain, that Jewish converts *only*

are addressed in the epistle to the Galatians; an opinion incapable no doubt of being defended, but still serving to shew that Storr has, in the case before us, taken much more for granted than can be readily allowed.

Moreover, it is not so *singular* as Storr represents it to be, that Jewish converts should be exclusively addressed in one case, and Gentile ones in another. The church at Ephesus, for example, consisted, beyond all doubt, of a mixture of Jews and Gentiles. Yet, in the epistle which Paul wrote to them, he has addressed only the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη--ἀχροβυστία, Eph. 2: 11, also 3: 1). But who ever thought it necessary, in order to account for this, to suppose that Paul also wrote another letter, at the same time, to the Jewish part of the church at Ephesus ?

Besides, what object could be answered by writing two *separate* letters, at the same time ? Was it not a matter of course, that the whole church should be made acquainted with an apostolic letter to one part of it ? Is there not abundant evidence, that the letters of the apostles were regarded and treated by the early churches as encyclical, or (as we call them) *circulars* ? When Peter wrote his second epistle to various churches in Asia Minor, he adverts to Paul's epistles as being already known to them, 2 Pet. 3: 16. And when Clement of Rome, within the first century, wrote his epistle to the Corinthians, he made extracts from nearly all the epistles of Paul, without even naming them ; which certainly implies, that he regarded the Corinthian church as being already well acquainted with them. Such being the state of knowledge respecting the apostolic epistles, in the early churches, it is a very improbable supposition, that either the epistle to the Galatians, or that to the Hebrews, was designed to be kept secret from the Jewish or Gentile Christians at Galatia, if written to them. Indeed, an arrangement of this nature would have worn the appearance of a worldly policy, and of a kind of double dealing ; which is far from being characteristic of Paul, and which would have served rather to alienate than to reconcile those who were ready to renounce his authority.

The *possibility*, that the two letters should have been written at the same time, may for the sake of argument be conceded.

But the *necessity* of such a supposition, on grounds alleged by Storr, is contradicted by the state of the epistle to the Ephesians, which is addressed to *Gentiles only*. If the probability of it has not already been shown to be little or nothing, in the sequel, I trust, this will be made satisfactorily apparent.

(2.) ‘The epistle to the Hebrews,’ says Storr, ‘has no salutation, (which all the other epistles of Paul have); it wants the usual greeting at the close; and it no where exhibits the name of the author. These facts, now, are easily accounted for, if we suppose that this epistle was sent at the same time with that to the Galatians, which Paul says he wrote *with his own hand*, Gal. 6: 11. It is probable that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by the aid of an amanuensis; and as it was sent along with an epistle written and subscribed by Paul in his own handwriting, a salutation and subscription were unnecessary or superfluous.’

But why so? Why did not the longer epistle to the Hebrews need as many marks of authenticity, as the shorter one to the Galatians? Is the subject less important? Are the persons addressed less regarded by the writer? And why should the fact, (if it be one, for this too is mere conjecture), that an amanuensis wrote one letter, supersede all effort to authenticate it, when Paul has been so careful to render the other letter authentic, which was written with his own hand? During such a contest between parties as existed at Galatia, is there any probability that either letter would be left deficient as to evidences of genuineness, when the whole weight of the apostle’s authority was needed to check the growing evil there? Would not the apostle at least intimate plainly in one letter, that he had written another? So far from salutation or subscription being superfluous, in such a case, the one or the other, or rather both of them, would seem to be peculiarly needed, in order that neither letter should fail of its proper destination, or have its genuineness disputed.

(3.) ‘In Gal. 6: 16, it is said,” As many as walk by this rule, peace be on them, and mercy be upon *the Israel of God*.” Now the phrase, *Israel of God*, means the *Jewish Converts* at Galatia, in distinction from the *Gentile* ones; and this conveys an in-



timation, that the apostle had written to these Jewish converts, as well as to them, the Gentile ones.'

This argument, however, is built upon an exegesis of the passage quoted, which is inadmissible. The *Israel of God* is plainly a figurative name for true Christians. Paul had shown in the previous part of his epistle, that those "who are of the faith," whether Jews or Gentiles, are the children of Abraham, 3: 7, 29. At the close, he pronounces a blessing on such as adopt the principles, and obey the injunctions, which he had communicated; and concludes it, very appositely to his purpose, by calling such the Israel of God, *καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ*. The *καὶ* which stands before this clause seems clearly to be *explicative*, and not *conjunctive*; amounting merely to our English *namely, even, to wit*, or to some word of the same import, and placing τὸν Ἰσραὴλ in apposition with the preceding ἐπ' αὐτούς.

But even supposing the apostle does advert here only to the *Jewish* converts, as such; where is the intimation to be found that he had written to them? Or, if he had, that the letter was the same with our present epistle to the Hebrews?

(4.) 'The epistles to the Hebrews and to the Galatians must have been written about the same time; and probably both were written at Corinth, during Paul's first abode there. Here Paul found Priscilla and Aquila, who had fled from Italy, on account of Claudius' decree which banished the Jews from Rome, Acts 18: 1, 2; and at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, the writer says, *They of Italy (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) salute you*, which means, 'Priscilla and Aquila from Italy salute you.' The coincidence of such circumstances renders it probable, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written at Corinth.—And as to the epistle to the Galatians, it was written between the time of Paul's second and third visit to Galatia; and consequently must have been written during some of his journies recorded in Acts xvi. xvii. and xviii. which are occupied with the history of the apostle in the interval of time between those visits. But if written during this interval, when can it with so much probability be considered to have been written, as within the eighteen months' abode of Paul at Corinth, during the same time? Consequently it is probable, that both

letters were written at the same place, and about the same time; and it may therefore be concluded, that the supposition of their having been sent to Galatia at the same time, is correct.'

Ingenious and specious as this may appear, at first view, it is far from being satisfactory, when we come to examine its parts in detail. In respect to those circumstances, which Storr represents as shewing that the epistle to the Hebrews was written at Corinth, they are far from being decisive. Supposing (with him) that *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*, in the greeting at the close, means Priscilla and Aquila; is it necessary that the salutation from them should have been sent from Corinth? Did they not afterwards travel with Paul to Ephesus? Acts 18: 18, 19. And were they not probably at Rome, during his captivity there? In Rom. 16: 3, a salutation is sent to them as being at Rome; and of course they were there before Paul went thither as a prisoner, because his epistle to the Romans was written before that event, Rom. 1: 9—12. How then can we assume that Corinth is the only place from which Paul sent, or could send, the salutation of these Italians to Galatia?

But another consideration must be brought into our account. Storr's exegesis of the expression *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* is altogether improbable. How should two strangers, *lately* (*προσφάτως*) come from Rome to Corinth, Acts 18: 2, be so well acquainted with the church at Galatia, (situated in the interior and very remotest part of Asia Minor, and having but little intercourse with the world,) that it was not necessary even to name them to this church, but simply to advert to them by the periphrasis, *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*? How did the Galatians know that Priscilla and Aquila were at Corinth? Or how could they distinguish them from many other Jews that fled from Rome, after the edict of Claudius proscribing the Jews was published? Besides, in all other cases where Paul sends greetings from these Italians, or to them, he calls them by name; e. g. 1 Cor. 16: 19. 2 Tim. 4: 19. Rom. 16: 3. This view of the subject, therefore, renders highly improbable the very circumstance which Storr has *assumed* as a *fact*, in order to make out that the epistle to the Hebrews was written at Corinth.

Next, as to the epistle to the Galatians. It was written, he says, between Paul's second and third journey to Galatia ; therefore, most probably, *during his stay at Corinth*, which happened in that interval of time.

But, if we follow the account of Luke in the Acts, it is difficult, nay impossible, to defend the supposition of Storr, that the epistle to the Galatians was written after the second visit of Paul to Galatia. Acts 16: 6 gives us the first intimation of a visit to Galatia by Paul ; and his second visit is described in Acts 18: 22, 23, which was *after he had left Corinth*, and travelled through Palestine and Asia Minor. I know, indeed, some critics have *conjectured* that Paul made a journey to Galatia, previously to the one first mentioned by Luke in Acts 16: 6. But of what avail are *conjectures* in such cases, when they are supported neither by the epistle to the Galatians, nor by the history of Paul ?

Nothing, then, but *supposition* is offered by Storr, to show that either the epistle to the Hebrews, or that to the Galatians, was written at Corinth, or that both were written about the same time ; and of course, these circumstances cannot be assumed as *proved*, or even as rendered probable, in order to build the conclusion on them, that the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle to the Galatians were written simultaneously to the same church.

(5.) ' Timothy originated from the neighbourhood of Galatia, and was no doubt in company with Paul during his journey there, as mentioned in Acts 16: 6. It is a singular circumstance, that although the apostle so often joins his name with his own, in the salutations contained in his other letters, he has not joined him in his epistle to the Galatian church ; *especially singular*, in as much as Timothy must have been so well known to the Galatians, and as he was with Paul at Corinth. But this apparent singularity is accounted for, when we suppose that Timothy was sent with both the letters in question to the Galatians ; who, of course, would receive his salutation from his own mouth.'

But is it not more singular still, I ask, that Paul should say, at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, *Know ye that our brother*

*Timothy is ἀπολελυμένον*, i. e. either *sent away* on some errand, or *set at liberty*? Was it necessary to tell the Galatian church this, when Timothy was before their eyes *in propria persona*? I know indeed that Storr, in order to avoid this striking incongruity, has translated *γινώσχετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον* thus, *Receive honorably our brother Timothy who is sent to you*; but it is a violence done to the natural import of the language, which no other respectable critic that I know of has sanctioned, and to do which, I must think, nothing but the eagerness of supporting a favourite theory could have led this excellent writer.

(6.) 'The epistle of Paul to the Galatians, both in matter and manner, has many striking coincidences with the epistle to the Hebrews.'

No doubt this is true. But it is equally true also of other epistles of Paul; with the exception, that the subject in the epistle to the Galatians particularly resembles, in some important respects, that of the epistle to the Hebrews, and is prosecuted more extensively in the latter epistle, than in any of the other acknowledged epistles of Paul. Noesselt has used the same argument, in order to prove that the epistle to the Hebrews must have been written to the church in Thessalonica: and Weber, to shew that it was written to the Corinthians. Might it not be used, with similar effect, to show also that it was written to the Romans? Such an argument may be of some weight, in the question whether Paul, or some other person, wrote the epistle to the Hebrews; but it cannot be of much avail to show that this epistle was written to the church at Galatia, rather than to some other church.

(7.) But the argument on which Storr seems to place most reliance of all, and which, if well founded, is of a *historical* and not of a conjectural nature, is that deduced from 2 Pet. 3: 14—16.

As this passage is not only adduced by Storr, for the purpose of shewing that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Galatians, but by him and many other critics of great reputation, for the purpose of proving that Paul must have been the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; in order to save repetition, I shall here examine it in reference to both of these topics, since I must

of necessity institute an examination of it, with respect to the topic now under discussion.

The passage runs thus : "Wherefore, beloved, since ye are in expectation of these things [viz. the changes described in the preceding context], make strenuous efforts that ye may be found of him [Christ] in peace, without spot and blameless ; and consider the delay of our Lord to come, as a matter of favour : as also our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, *hath written to you* ; as [he has done] likewise in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things : in which are some things hard to be understood ; which the ignorant and the unstable pervert, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction."

To understand the nature of the argument drawn from this, we must advert to some circumstances mentioned in the epistles of Peter. His first epistle is directed to the churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, 1 Pet. 1: 1. His second is directed to the same churches ; for he says, "This second epistle, beloved, I write to you, in which I aim to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance," 2 Pet. 3: 1. To the above named churches in Asia Minor, then, the second epistle of Peter was directed.

The nature of Storr's argument may now be understood. It is this. 'All the epistles of Paul, excepting that to the Hebrews, have designated the churches to which they were sent ; the epistle to the Hebrews does not. Peter says that Paul had written a letter to the churches in Asia Minor, whom he addresses ; *as our beloved brother Paul hath written to you*. Now this cannot advert to any of his letters which have *inscriptions*, as they are not directed to the aforementioned churches in Asia Minor. Consequently, Peter must refer to the epistle to the Hebrews, which is the only one that has no inscription. It follows, therefore, not only that Paul wrote this letter, but that he wrote it to some of the churches addressed by Peter. Most probably, then, it was written to Galatia. Especially is this credible, since the epistle to the Hebrews contains those very warnings and senti-

ments to which Peter adverts, as being comprised in the letter of Paul to the churches in Asia Minor whom he addresses.'

One is tempted, at first view, to acquiesce in a statement seemingly so probable, and to conclude that the inference drawn by Storr is substantially supported. A closer examination, however, suggests formidable difficulties, which must not be passed over in silence.

I omit, at present, any consideration respecting the genuineness of the second epistle of Peter, so much called in question, and disputed by many churches of ancient times. It is unnecessary here to take other ground in regard to it, than Storr himself has taken; which is, to admit its genuineness.

What then does the passage of Peter, now in question, teach us?

(1.) That Paul had written a letter to the churches whom Peter addressed, ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν. (2.) That he had urged on them the same considerations which Peter himself had urged; *even as our beloved brother Paul hath written to you.* (3) That in all his epistles (viz. all that had been read by them), he had urged the same, or the like considerations; *as likewise in all his epistles, speaking in them concerning these things.*

The question, on which the point under discussion mainly turns, is, What are the *things* to which Peter refers, as treated of in common by him and by Paul?

To find an answer to this, we may make three suppositions. First, they are *all* the subjects treated of in the preceding part of Peter's epistle; or secondly, they are those comprised in the preceding part of the third chapter; or thirdly, they are those things suggested by the immediate context, in connexion with the passage already cited.

Now the *first* of these suppositions cannot be admitted; for Paul is so far from treating, in all his epistles, of every subject comprised in the whole of Peter's second epistle, that he has no where treated of some of them. If Peter, then, referred to the epistles of Paul which are now extant, it is clear, he did not mean to say, that Paul had in *every* epistle of his discussed the

same subjects, as he himself had done throughout his second letter.

But Storr urges in a special manner the *second* supposition, viz. that the *subjects* presented to view in the *third* chapter of Peter's second epistle, are particularly treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews; and consequently that Peter must have referred to *these* subjects, and to *that* epistle. The sum of the *third* chapter of Peter is, 'That the heavens and the earth are perishable; that they will be destroyed by fire; that the delay to destroy the ungodly must not be imputed to slackness on the part of the Lord, who puts off this catastrophe on account of his longsuffering towards men; and that the time when they shall be dissolved by fire, will come speedily, and unexpectedly, and then the heavens and the earth will be destroyed, and a new heaven and a new earth created.' Such is the context. Then follows the exhortation; "Beloved, keep yourselves unspotted, and blameless; and regard the delay of your Lord's coming as a favor; *even as our beloved brother, Paul, has written to you, etc.*" Now *where* has Paul written any thing respecting the dissolution of the material elements of the universe by fire, and the creating of new heavens and a new earth instead of them? I do not find this subject treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews; nor is it touched upon in *all* the epistles of Paul; it is only adverted to in *some* of them.

It is then, *thirdly*, the exhortation in the immediate context, *to keep themselves unspotted and blameless, in view of their Lord's coming*, which Peter means to say had been urged by Paul on the persons whom he addressed, as well as by himself. This is the plain *grammatical* construction; and it is the only one which will bear examination, by comparing it with the contents of Paul's epistles.

But exhortation of such a nature is far from being contained only in the epistle to the Hebrews. The epistles to the Corinthians, Philippians, the first to the Thessalonians, the first to Timothy, and that to Titus, contain direct exhortations of this sort, and the other epistles of Paul, repeated intimations of the same nature. If the argument is good, then, to prove that the epistle

to the Hebrews was written to the Galatians, because it contains such sentiments and exhortations; the same argument might prove that any of the other epistles of Paul were written to the same church, because they contain the like sentiments.

But there is one of the churches in Asia Minor to which Peter wrote, namely that of Galatia, to which a letter of Paul now extant is addressed. May not this be the very epistle to which Peter adverts, and not the epistle to the Hebrews? In chapter 6: 7—9, is a passage of warning and exhortation, grounded on the doctrine of future retribution. This may be the very passage to which Peter adverts; or if any should think it too *general* to satisfy the reference which he makes, then the exhortation may have been in a letter now lost. That some of Paul's letters are lost is pretty certain, from 1 Cor. 5: 9—11. See also, Phil. 3: 1. Evidently one of John's epistles is lost. "I wrote to the church," says he in his second epistle, verse 9, "but Diotrophes, who loves preeminence, did not receive us." We have no remains of the epistle to which he here adverts. The letter of Paul, which Peter mentions, may have shared the same fate. At most, the epistle to the Hebrews, even supposing it to be proved that Paul wrote it, has no special claim to be considered as the one adverted to by Peter.

If then it cannot be shewn, (as I am fully persuaded it cannot), that Peter, in the passage under consideration, adverts to the epistle to the Hebrews, it cannot, of course, be shewn from Peter's testimony, that Paul wrote this epistle. This argument has, indeed, been often and strongly urged, in order to establish this point, by modern and late critics; but it will not abide the test of examination. The ancient church, it is well known, never brought it forward to support the opinion that Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Storr himself, who urges it very strongly, concedes that it was never employed by the Christian fathers. It does not follow, indeed, that it has no validity, because it was not employed by them. But it would seem, at least, that the proof to be derived from it is not so *obvious*, nor so *conclusive*, as some modern critics have deemed it.

(8.) Storr adduces 'the special circumstances of the churches



addressed in the epistles to the Galatians and to the Hebrews, as a ground for the opinion, that both epistles were directed to the church at Galatia. The Galatians,' says he, 'had for a *long* time been Christians ; so had the Hebrews. The Galatians were persecuted and misled by false teachers, and were in danger of defection from Christianity ; so were the Hebrews.'

Now so far from finding evidence of sameness, in the representations of the two epistles respecting these circumstances, I find proof of dissimilarity so great as to exclude all hope of supporting the opinion of Storr, and to shew that the admission of it would do great violence to the laws of probability. To the Galatians Paul says, "I marvel that ye are *so soon* removed from him who called you to the grace of Christ, unto another gospel," Gal. 1: 6. To the Hebrews he says, "When for the time [i. e. plainly the long time since they professed Christianity] ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again to be taught the first elements of religion," Heb. 5: 12. And again, "Call to mind the *former days* in which, when ye were enlightened, ye endured a great fight of afflictions," 10: 32. And again, the writer calls on them to "remember the example of their *former teachers*, who were deceased," 13: 7.

Then as to persecution, the Hebrews had suffered the loss of their property by it, 10: 34 ; but there is no intimation of this in respect to the Galatians. Indeed, there is no proof, that out of Palestine persecution was such, in the apostolic age, (one or two instances only excepted), as to deprive men of either property or life. The Roman magistracy did not permit this, either out of Palestine or in it, so long as they were in authority. This is evident from several passages of history in the Acts; e.g. Acts 18: 12, 17. 19: 35—40. Acts xvi. xxvi. Then there is a great difference between the kind of persecution animadverted upon in the epistle to the Galatians, and in that to the Hebrews. In the *former*, Christians are addressed as in danger, from their pressure, of incorporating Judaism with Christianity, and making the continued profession of it essential to salvation ; in the *latter*, they are every where addressed, as in danger of a final and total renunciation of the Christian religion. In the one, they are debort-

ed from superadding the Jewish ceremonies to Christianity ; in the other, from utterly abandoning the Christian religion.

But further ; Paul says, in Gal. 6: 11, “Ye see how LARGE a letter I have written to you with my own hand.” Yet this epistle consists of only *six* chapters of a moderate length. How then could Paul say to a part of the *same* church, in a letter accompanying this, “I beseech you, brethren, to bear with a word of exhortation from me, for I have written unto you *διὰ βραχέων*, IN A FEW WORDS,” or *briefly*, Heb. 13: 22. Yet this *brief* epistle is more than twice as long, as the *large* letter which accompanied it. Could Paul so forget himself, on such an occasion as this ?

Again, Paul often adverts, in his epistle to the Galatians, to the fact that he was the first who taught them the doctrines of Christianity. Yet in the epistle to the Hebrews there is not a word of this ; but, plainly, the whole manner of the letter, and specially the manner in which he speaks of the teachers of those whom he addresses, implies that he had not himself planted the church, to which his letter was directed.

But what determines the question beyond all hope of supporting the views of Storr, is, that in the epistle to the Galatians, their *teachers* are animadverted upon with great severity, on account of their improper conduct and erroneous doctrines. They are represented as perverting the gospel of Christ ; as having an erroneous zeal for selfish purposes, 4: 17. 5: 13 ; and the apostle even proceeds so far as to express a wish, that they might be cut off from the church, 5: 12. But how totally different is the character given of teachers, in the epistle to the Hebrews. “Obey your teachers, and be subject to them ; for they watch over your souls, as they who must give an account ;” i. e. they are altogether worthy of your confidence and obedience, 13: 17. And at the close of the letter, he sends his affectionate salutations to them, 13: 24.

These considerations seem to remove all probability, and even possibility, that the epistle to the Hebrews was, as Storr maintains, written at the same time and place as the epistle to the Galatians, and that it was also directed to the same church.

The excellent character and distinguished acuteness of Storr, entitle almost any opinion which he has seriously defended to examination ; but I cannot resist the impression, that he has utterly failed in defending the sentiment which has now been examined.

I have, throughout this investigation, proceeded on the supposition that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews ; which Storr fully believed, and the belief of which is necessary, in order that one may adopt the sentiment which he has maintained in respect to its destination. Whether there is sufficient reason to believe that Paul was the author of the epistle, will be a subject of discussion in a subsequent part of this introduction. In the mean time, I shall concede this point, (while examining the question relative to its destination,) to all the writers who have assumed it, in supporting their respective opinions. Such is the case with all those, whose various opinions relative to the destination of our epistle still remain to be examined.

#### § 6. *Was the epistle directed to the church at Thessalonica ?*

The character which has just been given of Storr will also apply, in respect to some of its prominent traits, to Noesselt, late professor of Theology at Halle, who has maintained, in an essay devoted to this purpose,\* that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the churches in Macedonia, or rather to the church at Thessalonica. Semler had done this before him ; but on somewhat different grounds, and with less plausible reasons. On this account, I shall now, without particularly adverting to the efforts of Semler, proceed to examine the more ably supported opinion of Noesselt.

The general principle, to which Noesselt makes an appeal in his argument, is, in itself considered, correct. He endeavours to show, that ' there are circumstances mentioned in the epistle to the Hebrews, in Paul's epistles to the Thessalonian church, and in the life of this apostle, which afford a very striking agreement ; so striking as to render it altogether probable, that Paul

---

\* Contained in his *Opuscula*.

must have directed to this church the epistle which is now inscribed, *To the Hebrews*; and that he must have written it during his abode of eighteen months at Corinth, as recorded in Acts xviii. Let us examine these circumstances.

(1.) 'When Paul visited Corinth for the first time, he found Priscilla and Aquila there, who had recently fled from Italy, on account of the decree of Claudius which banished the Jews from Rome, Acts 18: 1, 2. At the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, he says, "They of Italy salute you;" meaning Priscilla and Aquila. Here then is a circumstance in the epistle to the Hebrews, which accords with the circumstances of Paul, during his first visit to Corinth.'

But, as I have before remarked (p. 16), Paul was in company with these Italians at other places besides Corinth. From some of these other places, then, he *might* have written this salutation. Besides, is there any probability, (as I have before asked), that two strangers, who had *recently* (*προσφάτως*) come from a city so distant as Rome, should be so well known to the Thessalonians in the extreme northeastern part of Greece, that they need not even be named, but simply called *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*, in a greeting or salutation? And particularly so, as neither of them were officers in the church, or public teachers. In all other cases, as has been already shewn, Paul expressly *names* these persons, when he adverts to them. Why should he depart here from his usual custom?

(2.) 'Paul says, at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, that Timothy was *ἀπολελυμένον*, *sent away*; and Paul had sent Timothy from Berea to Thessalonica, while Paul himself was at Athens, a little before he came to Corinth, comp. Acts 17: 13—16. Here then is a concurrence of circumstances, which favours the opinion that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul at *Corinth*, and directed to the Thessalonians.'

To understand the nature of this argument, and the reply which I have to make, it is necessary to advert, for a moment, to the history of Paul's journies at the time now under consideration. Paul, in company with Silas and Timothy, first preached the gospel at Thessalonica, where a church was formed; but

being vehemently opposed by some of the Jews, they went to Berea a neighbouring city, Acts 17: 10. Thither the persecuting Jews of Thessalonica followed them ; in consequence of which, Paul, leaving Silas and Timothy there, withdrew to Athens. Here he resided a short time, and then went on his first visit to Corinth, Acts 17: 1—15. 18: 1. At this last place, he staid eighteen months, Acts 18: 11. Now Noesselt supposes, that before Paul left Athens, he sent Timothy (who was still at Berea Acts 17: 10, 14) back to Thessalonica, in order to make inquiries respecting the state of the church there ; and that this is the meaning of that passage at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, *Ye know*, (as he would translate it), *that our brother Timothy is sent away*.

But as there is nothing of all this in the history which Luke has given of Paul and Timothy, Acts xvii. and as the whole must therefore be founded on *conjecture*, it might be sufficient, on the other hand, to *conjecture* that Paul did *not* send Timothy from Berea to Thessalonica, as Noesselt supposes.

However, respect for so excellent a critic as Noesselt, would rather demand some argument to shew that this conjecture cannot be well founded. I would observe, then, that in order to render his position probable, he assumes as a fact, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written *before* the epistles to the Thessalonians ; a supposition not capable of being rendered *probable*, much less of being proved.

It will be admitted, that there is not a word in our present first epistle to the Thessalonians, respecting any *previous* letter addressed to them ; a circumstance not to be imagined, provided the apostle had written such a laboured epistle to them as that to the Hebrews is, and on such an important question. Besides, it appears altogether probable from Acts 18: 1—6, that Silas and Timothy arrived at Corinth soon after Paul had gone there ; so that the absence of Timothy, supposed by Noesselt to have taken place at the time when the epistle to the Hebrews was written, cannot be rendered at all probable, from this part of Paul's history ; for it cannot be thought *probable*, that such an epistle as that to the Hebrews would be written by Paul *immediately* after

his arrival at Corinth, amidst all the agitation and dispute and hazard occasioned by his first preaching there. But even conceding that this *might* have been done ; is it probable that Paul, who (according to Noesselt) had just before, while at Athens, sent Timothy to Thessalonica, and who knew that he was *now there*, should gravely write to the Thessalonians, *Ye know that our brother Timothy is sent away* ; when this same Timothy, *in propria persona*, was present with the very church to whom this was written ?

(3.) ‘ In Heb. 10: 34, Paul says, *Ye had compassion on my bonds* ; or, according to another reading of equal authority, *Ye had compassion on those who were bound*, i.e. the prisoners. This refers to Paul’s imprisonment, as related in Acts 16: 23—40 ; and to the sympathy which the Thessalonians evinced for him in these circumstances.’

But this imprisonment was at Philippi, *before* Paul had visited Thessalonica, and before the Thessalonians could know that he was in their region, except by report. This imprisonment lasted but a *few hours* ; it ended in a most triumphant deliverance by the interposition of divine power, and in the shame and mortification of the magistracy who had ordered it. The whole occurrence, instead of demanding *compassionate* sympathy, was a matter of *triumph* and *congratulation*. Or if otherwise, it was not an affliction in respect to which the Thessalonians could compassionate Paul, as they could not know of its having happened, until it was past.

(4.) ‘ The Hebrews are praised for their liberality ; and so are the Thessalonians.’

To which I reply, So are other churches. Does it follow, because they exhibited this trait of character which was *common* among Christians in the apostolic age, that the Thessalonian church must have been the same which is thus recommended in the epistle to the Hebrews ?

(5.) ‘ The persons, to whom the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed, had suffered persecution, Heb. 10: 32. 12: 4 ; which was also the case with the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. 2: 14—16. 2 Thess. 1. 11.’

So had many other churches. But neither at Thessalonica, nor scarcely any where else, except in Palestine, do we know of a persecution, at this period, which involved the loss of property and the hazard of liberty and life. The epistle to the Hebrews speaks of their being despoiled of their property, 10: 34 ; a circumstance not to be found in the account of the persecution at Thessalonica, and one which makes directly against the supposition of Noesselt.

(6.) 'The Thessalonians were in danger of defection from the faith, so that Paul was obliged to send Timothy to confirm them, 1 Thess. 3: 2, 3 ; and the same danger is every where adverted to, in the epistle to the Hebrews.'

This argument is built on an erroneous exegesis. That Timothy made a visit to *confirm* the Thessalonians, does not surely imply that they were in special danger of apostasy. When Paul is said to have gone through Asia Minor *confirming* the churches, Acts 15: 36—41. 16: 4—6. 18: 23, are we to draw the inference that all the churches there were in the same danger of apostasy, as the persons to whom the epistle to the Hebrews is addressed ? If not, this argument of Noesselt has no force to establish the opinion which he advocates.

(7.) 'There is a great similarity between the epistle to the Hebrews, and the epistle to the Thessalonians.'

So there is, also, between the epistle to the Hebrews and all the epistles of Paul. This argument, then, proves too much. It may serve to shew that Paul probably wrote the epistle to the Hebrews ; but it can have no important influence on the question, *To whom* did he write this epistle ?

Most of the similarities, moreover, which are produced by Noesselt, are similarities of a *general* nature in respect to sentiments of piety and morality. Must there not be a similarity, of course, in these respects, in all the epistles of Paul, provided he always taught the same doctrines of Christianity ?

But the *dissimilarities* between the epistles to the Thessalonians and the Hebrews, Noesselt has not proceeded to develop. Yet there are some ; and some so striking, as to render the supposition which he defends altogether improbable. The Hebrews

addressed in our epistle had been for a *long* time Christians ; but if Noesselt's supposition be true, they had been so only a *few months*, at most, when Paul wrote his first epistle to them ; for Paul had only made a rapid journey from Thessalonica, to Athens, and thence to Corinth ; and soon after his arrival there, and (as Noesselt thinks) before Timothy had come to him, he wrote the epistle in question.

I may add, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews no where adverts to his having *first* planted Christianity among them. But Paul, in his epistle to the Thessalonians, very frequently adverts to this circumstance.

Further, the epistle to the Hebrews is directed to a church almost wholly (if not altogether) *Jewish* ; while it is plain, from Acts 17 : 4, 5. that only a *few* Jews had early joined the Thessalonian church ; and plainer still, that this church was principally made up of Gentiles, from Paul's first epistle to them, 1 : 9. where he says, 'Ye have *turned from idols* to serve the living God.' Now circumstances so widely diverse and opposite, cannot be predicated of the same church, while they have respect only to an interval of time, which, at the most, cannot exceed the eighteen months that Paul abode at Corinth.

Finally, Paul's two epistles to the Thessalonians, throughout, are filled with commendations of the Thessalonian church, for their firmness and stedfastness, in the faith of the gospel. Not a word of their Jewish prejudices. Not a reference to the imminent danger of apostasy, which is every where developed in the epistle to the Hebrews. Noesselt accounts for this, by the supposition that Paul's first epistle to them, viz. that to the Hebrews, (as he supposes), had produced a thorough reformation among them. But when Paul's *first* epistle to the Corinthians had effected a reformation, in respect to various particulars of far less importance than those treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews, how does the apostle fill his *second* letter with commendations, which have a direct reference to his former admonitions ? Could it be otherwise here, if the epistle to the Hebrews had been written before our present epistles to the Thessalonians, and produced such an effect as Noesselt supposes ?



On the whole, then, the supposition of Noesselt must be abandoned; not only because it is not well supported, but because it involves difficulties and improbabilities so great as to render it altogether incredible.

§ 7. *Was it directed to Hebrews, who were sojourners in Asia Minor?*

Bolten, (who has distinguished himself, in a peculiar manner, by a translation of the New Testament with constant reference to the Syriac or Syro-chaldaic language, in which he supposes many of the original documents must have been composed,) has advanced the opinion, that the Hebrews, addressed in our epistle, were those who had fled from Palestine, about A. D. 60, on account of the persecutions there, and were scattered abroad in Asia Minor. To this he thinks the *οἱ καταφυγόντες* in 6: 18 refers; as also the passage in 13: 14, which speaks of their having *no abiding city*. He finds parallels of such a meaning, in 3 John vs. 5 and 7, where *strangers* are mentioned, and those *who have gone abroad* (ἐξῆλθον) *for his (Christ's) name's sake*; in 1 Pet. 1: 1, where *sojourners of the dispersion* are mentioned; and in James 1: 1, where the *οἱ ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ* are addressed.

I am unable, however, to find any history of a persecution in Palestine, at the period which he mentions, or any account of a dispersion of Jewish Christians abroad, at that period. As to the texts which he cites, in favour of his supposition, they will not bear the construction which he has put upon them. *We who have fled*, Hebrews 6: 18, is inseparably connected with the clause which follows, viz. *to lay hold on the hope set before us*, i. e. in the gospel. Besides, the writer does not say *you* who have fled, but *we*, i. e. Christians. So also in 13: 14, it is *we* (viz. Christians) *who have no abiding city*, i. e. no permanent place of happiness in the present world. The passage in 3 John vs. 5, 7, probably refers to Gentile Christians, who became exiles; and those in James and Peter, have respect merely to Jews who *lived* in foreign countries, in distinction from those who lived in Palestine.

Besides, how could the apostle address *wandering* fugitives, scattered over Asia Minor, and destitute of a home, as in a condition to bestow charity? 13: 1, 2, 16. How could he speak of them as having stated teachers? 13: 17, 24. How could he expect his letter to reach them; or promise them a visit with Timothy, 13: 23, in case he should speedily return?

Respectable as the critic is who has advanced this opinion, it seems to be quite destitute of probability, and entitled to but little consideration.

§ 8. *Was the epistle addressed to the church at Corinth?*

Michael Weber, who has distinguished himself in some respects as a critical writer on the canon of the New Testament, has advanced and endeavoured to support the opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the church at Corinth. He labours, in the first place, to shew that Paul wrote no less than five letters to the Corinthians. The first was one which has been lost, and which Paul mentions in our present 1 Cor. 5: 9—13; the second and third were our first to the Corinthians, and so much of the second as includes chapters 1—ix. with the two last verses of the epistle; the fourth, our present epistle to the Hebrews; and the fifth the remainder of the second epistle to the Corinthians: all which, he thinks, were written in the order now suggested.

Proceeding on the ground of such an arrangement of Paul's letters, he endeavours to support his opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Corinthians, by arguments which I shall now examine.

(1.) 'The Hebrews became Christians at an early period, and so did the Corinthians; the Hebrews were Judaizing Christians, and so were the Corinthians. An agreement in these respects renders it probable that the epistle to the Hebrews was sent to the church at Corinth.'

But Paul did not visit Corinth until A. D. 51 or 52, after he had repeatedly traversed the various countries of Asia Minor, and founded several churches in Macedonia. It cannot therefore be

called an *early* period, at which the Corinthians were converted. Paul established few if any new churches, *after* the establishment of this at Corinth ; at least, history does not give us any account of them.

In respect to the Corinthians being *Judaizing* Christians, the proof is altogether wanting. The apostle has taken no notice of any contest or question of this nature among them. He has indeed, in 2 Cor. 3: 6—18, drawn a parallel between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations ; but it is of a general nature, and touches none of the points usually contested by Judaizing Christians. In 2 Cor. 12: 13—23, to which Weber appeals for proof of his assertion, it is plain, that some Judaizing teacher (or teachers) is adverted to by Paul ; whose conduct he describes, in terms which convey very strong disapprobation. But this, instead of aiding to establish the position of Weber, seems absolutely to overthrow it ; for in the epistle to the Hebrews, the *teachers* (as we have already had occasion to remark, p. 24) are *commended*, as being altogether worthy of confidence and obedience, Heb. 13: 17, 24. We have already seen, moreover, that the church at Corinth consisted, at first, of but few Jews ; as is plain from the history of Paul's planting it there, Acts xviii.

(2.) 'There is a most striking resemblance between the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle to the Corinthians.'

This Weber labours to establish, by a comparison of the methods in which each quotes the Old Testament ; of the *ἀπαξ λεγόμενα* ; and of the similitudes employed.

That there is a similarity, I should readily concede. But resemblance, and even striking resemblance, is not confined merely to the epistles addressed to the Corinthians and to the Hebrews. Storr finds it between the epistles to the Galatians and to the Hebrews ; Noesselt, between the epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Hebrews ; and it may be easily shewn, (as it will be hereafter), that the epistle to the Hebrews has a striking resemblance to *all* the epistles of Paul, in a variety of respects. Why should we, or how can we, limit this to the epistles addressed to the Corinthians ?

But in various respects, in which Weber has undertaken to

make out a likeness between the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle to the Corinthians, it seems to me that he has entirely failed. In the epistle to the Hebrews, repeated reference is made to personal sufferings and loss of property, through persecution, Heb. 10: 33, 34. 12: 4; but in the epistle to the Corinthians, we discover no traces of such persecution; nor does the history of the church at Corinth give us any knowledge of persecution having early prevailed there. At all events, when our present first epistle to the Corinthians was written, it is clear that no such event had taken place at Corinth; for Paul says, 1 Cor. 10: 13, *no trial hath befallen you but such as is common to men*. Now as the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of *the great fight of afflictions*, 10: 33, 34, which they endured, when they were first enlightened, here is an absolute contradiction of Weber's supposition, instead of a confirmation of it.

(3.) 'The warnings, exhortations, and commendations for charity bestowed, are alike in the epistles to the Corinthians and to the Hebrews.'

But the same resemblances, which Weber finds between these epistles, Noesselt finds between the epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Hebrews. Such resemblances may be found, also, in other epistles. But they are of a nature too *general* to afford any evidence of weight, in such a question as the one before us. Does not every Christian church need *warning, reproof, consolation*? And is not every one that is charitable, entitled to *commendation*? It is not, therefore, from a comparison of general expressions of this nature, that the sameness of churches addressed can be proved. There must be something particular, local, and *sui generis*, to make such proof valid.

(4.) The greeting at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, Ἀσπάζονται ἑμῶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, Weber understands (like the critics whom I have already examined) as referring to Priscilla and Aquila; and compares it with the greeting from the same persons, in 1 Cor. 16: 19.

But in the latter place, they are *expressly* named, so that there is a striking *dissimilitude* instead of resemblance, in the manner of the salutation.

(5.) He further compares several ideas, in the epistle to the Corinthians and the epistle to the Hebrews; such as warnings taken from the example of ancient Israel, 1 Cor. 10: 1—12 and Heb. 3: 16—18; the doctrine that God chastises his children for their good, 1 Cor. 11: 32 and Heb. 12: 5—11; and some other things, about which similar views in both epistles are expressed.

The words, however, which are employed in these two cases, are, for the most part, quite diverse. And even if they were not, could Paul write on such subjects to no more than *one* church? And must that church be *only* at Corinth?

(6.) ‘But, the epistle to the Hebrews is called *λόγον παρακλήσεως*; and also in 2 Cor. 6: 1, Paul says *παρακαλοῦμεν*.’

True; but the same Paul repeatedly says *παρακαλέω* in his epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Thessalonians, and elsewhere. Was the epistle to the Hebrews written to these churches, because *παρακαλέω* is a word common to it and to the epistles directed to them?

(7.) ‘In 1 Cor. 4: 18, 19. 16: 2—7, the apostle has expressed his desire or determination to pay the Corinthians a visit; and at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, the same determination is expressed, Heb. 13: 23.’

But were there no other churches which the apostle desired or determined to visit, besides that at Corinth? And could he express the desire or determination to visit no other? Even if all this should be admitted, the determination to pay a visit, as expressed in our first epistle to the Corinthians, was abandoned when he wrote the second, 1: 15 seq.; which, according to Weber’s own arrangement, was written before our epistle to the Hebrews.

(8.) ‘From 1 Cor. 16: 10 it appears, that Timothy, when this letter was written, was absent from Paul; and in the epistle to the Hebrews, 13: 23, he is said to be sent away (*ἀπολελυμένον*). Here again is a similarity of circumstances.’

Granted; but was not Timothy constantly employed, in this manner, on errands of Paul to the churches? Was he absent *only once*? And could Paul tell no other church of his absence,

but that of Corinth? Besides, our second epistle to the Corinthians, (written according to Weber himself *before* our epistle to the Hebrews), makes it clear that Timothy had already returned; for he is joined with Paul, in the salutation at the beginning of the epistle, 2 Cor. 1: 1.

(9.) ‘Since the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews says, 13: 22, I have written to you *διὰ βραχέων*, *briefly*, this refers to our *second* epistle to the Corinthians, [which according to Weber consisted of the first nine chapters]; and the meaning of this phrase is, ‘My last epistle to you, (*viz.* the second epistle to the Corinthians), was short;’ implying, at the same time, that the present one is longer or more copious.’

But such an explanation the text will not bear. “I beseech you, brethren,” says the writer, “bear with my address to you, because (or, since) I have written briefly;” he evidently means, *briefly* in comparison with the importance of the subject and the occasion; briefly in comparison with the copiousness which his interested feelings for them and the cause of truth would have prompted. “I have written briefly” is an apology for the letter to the Hebrews which the writer was then concluding; and not for a *former* one to the church at Corinth. The incongruity of a supposition, such as Weber makes, is manifest, from the meaning of the very language which he quotes to support it. For how could the apostle say, that he had written *briefly*, in the second epistle to the Corinthians, and imply that he had written copiously in the epistle to the Hebrews; when, even abridged as Weber makes the former, it would be almost as long as the latter?

We have seen the inconclusive nature of Weber’s arguments, and their insufficiency to establish his opinion. It may now be observed, in addition, that the subjects treated of in the epistle to the Corinthians, and in that to the Hebrews, are widely different, in general, and quite dissimilar. Not a word in the epistle to the Hebrews of internal disorder, tumult, and parties in the church; no precepts about separation of husband and wife; none concerning meats offered to idols; none about the abuse of spiritual gifts; no discussion about the resurrection of the

body ; nothing about the denial of Paul's authority ; which, with various matters relating to decorum, constitute the principal subjects discussed in our present epistles to the Corinthians. On the other hand, in the epistles to the Corinthians there is nothing about apostasy ; nothing relative to persecution ; nothing in commendation of their teachers ; no apparent apprehension expressed respecting a Judaizing spirit in the church. If the epistles to the Corinthians have resemblances in expression and doctrine to the epistle to the Hebrews, (as all Paul's epistles certainly have a resemblance to it), are they not still so diverse as to the matters treated of, and as to the circumstances of the parties addressed, as to render hopeless all attempts to shew that our present epistles to the Hebrews and to the Corinthians were addressed to one and the same church ?

§ 9. *Was the epistle sent to Spain, or to Rome ?*

Ludwig has conjectured, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to a church in Spain ; and Wetstein, that it was written to the church at Rome. But these conjectures are altogether unsupported by the authors of them, and therefore need not delay our present investigation. We have the same liberty to conjecture, that it was written to some other place ; and the argument (if it be one) would be equally good.

§ 10. *Was it written to the church in Palestine ?*

I have examined the most specious opinions which modern criticism has offered, in order to shew that the epistle to the Hebrews was not directed to the church in Palestine, but to some church abroad. In ancient times, so far as I have been able to discover, there was but one opinion on this subject ; and this has been adopted and defended by a majority of distinguished critics, in modern and recent times. This opinion is, that THE EPISTLE WAS ADDRESSED TO THE HEBREW CHURCH OF PALESTINE. We come now to examine whether there is satisfactory evidence, that this opinion is well founded.

Many arguments have been employed to establish this supposition, which appear to be incapable of bearing the test of examination. Lardner and Michaelis, who in many respects were able critics, have brought together a number of such arguments. Regard for the opinions of such men, seems to render it necessary to subject these arguments to a brief review.

(a) Lardner adduces Heb. 1: 2, *God—hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son*; which he thinks, must designate those whom Christ *personally* addressed, i. e. the Jews.

But although it *may* have such a meaning, it is equally plain that it may have a different one, viz. *spoken unto Christians, or to men in general*. Thus the word *us* is in other places employed; e. g. Luke 1: 1, *The things fully credited by us*, i. e. by Christians.

(b) ‘Heb. 4: 2, *Unto us is the gospel preached, as well as unto them.*’

To this passage the remarks just made will apply, with the same force as to Heb. 1: 2.

(c) ‘Heb. 2: 1—4, *How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness by signs and wonders, etc.* Now Palestine was the place where miracles were performed.’

But miracles were also performed out of Palestine, by those who had heard Christ, as well as in it. And how then can it be a proof, that those addressed in the passage under examination belonged exclusively to Palestine? The meaning is (or at least *may be*), that Christianity was confirmed to *the men of that age*, by the miracles which were wrought by the immediate disciples of Christ. This sentiment, of course, has nothing necessarily *local* attached to it.

(d) ‘Those addressed by the epistle to the Hebrews were well acquainted with the sufferings of Christ; as the Christians of Judea must have been, 1: 3. 2: 9, 18. 5: 7, 8. 9: 14, 28. 10: 12. 12: 2, 3. 13: 12.’

And so were all to whom the apostles preached. Christ



*crucified* was the grand theme, the prominent subject, of apostolic preaching, 1 Cor. 2: 2. Gal. 6: 14.

(e) 'Heb. 5: 12, *But when for the time ye ought to be teachers of others, ye have need to learn the first principles ; which most suitably applies to Christians in Judea, to whom the gospel was first preached.*'

But if the epistle to the Hebrews was written after A. D. 60, (as is altogether probable, and as Lardner himself supposes), then the same thing might be said to many other churches out of Palestine, who were among the *early* converts.

(f) 'What is said of apostates, in ch. 6: 4—6 and 10: 26—29, is peculiarly applicable to apostates in Judea.'

But this may be very properly applied, also, to apostates elsewhere, in any other churches where the gospel had been fully preached.

(g) Heb. 13: 13, 14, *Let us therefore go forth to him [viz. Jesus] without the camp, bearing his reproach ; for here we have no permanent city, but we seek one which is to come.* This, Lardner and Michaelis both suppose, was addressed to Christians in Jerusalem, warning them to flee from that city, because the destruction of it would speedily take place.

But it seems quite plain to me, that this passage is merely an exhortation to self denial, and to patient endurance of suffering on account of Christ, and after his example ; couched in figurative language, and applicable to Christians in general of that or any other time or place.

(h) To these arguments Michaelis has added, Heb. 10: 25—37 ; *Exhorting one another ; and this so much the more, as ye see the day drawing near.—Yet a very little time, and he who is coming will come, and will not delay.* This, Michaelis thinks, is a warning to Christians in Jerusalem, that the destruction of the city was near at hand.

The obvious reply is, that the same consideration is addressed by Paul to churches and persons abroad ; e. g. to the Philippians, 4: 5 ; to the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. 5: 2—6, also v. 23 ; to Timothy, 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15 ; and by the apostle James, 5: 8, when writing to the twelve tribes dispersed abroad. How can-

such a warning, then, (admitting that the interpretation of it by Michaelis is correct), be considered as determining the *locality* of the epistle? The fall of *Jerusalem* surely would not endanger the *personal* safety of those who lived in Macedonia, and other places abroad.

(i) ‘Heb. 13: 9, *It is good that the heart should be confirmed by grace, not by meats; for those who are conversant with them are not profited.* This, must apply specially to the Jews of Palestine.’

But were there not Christian Jews, in other places, superstitiously attached to doctrines concerning distinctions of meats and drinks? Were not such to be found at Rome, in Galatia, at Colosse? If so, how can this text apply *exclusively* to Jews in Palestine?

On such arguments, then, dependence cannot well be placed, in order to establish the opinion which Michaelis and Lardner defend. It cannot be denied, indeed, that a peculiar significance would be attached to several of the passages that have now been examined, provided it could first be shewn that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally directed to Jews in Palestine. But it must be conceded, that these passages (in themselves considered) are not sufficiently discriminating, to determine the question whether it was so directed. If no other than such arguments can be adduced, then must we abandon the idea of being able to offer such proof as will satisfy a critical inquirer, that the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to the Hebrews of Palestine.

That such, however, was its first *original* direction, I am inclined to believe; and to this belief the following considerations have led me.

(1.) The *inscription* to this epistle most naturally leads to this supposition, and helps to strengthen it.

I am willing to concede the point, here, (for I think it may be shewn to the satisfaction of every one, who is well acquainted with the principles of critical inquiry), that this inscription is not *a manu auctoris*. Such is not the manner of the epistles. They contain *within themselves* the direction which the writer gave them. Thus Rom. 1: 1—7, “Paul an apostle—to the church at Rome :

1 Cor. 1: 1, 2, Paul an apostle—to the church of God at Corinth; Eph. 1: 1, Paul an apostle—to the saints at Ephesus; James 1: 1, James a servant of God, to the twelve tribes in dispersion; 1 Pet. 1: 1, Peter an apostle, to the sojourners in dispersion; 2 John v. 1, The elder, to the elect lady; Jude v. 1, Jude a servant of Jesus Christ—to those who are sanctified;” and so of other epistles. Moreover, there are reasons why the titles of the sacred books in general, throughout the Old and New Testaments, should not be regarded as coming from the hand of those who originally composed the books. Some of these inscriptions or titles are incongruous with the contents of the book, or chapter, to which they are prefixed. But one fact, on which I do not remember to have seen any comments made, is very striking. None of the New Testament writers, when they quote the Scriptures, ever appeal to the *names* of the Old Testament books. Nothing could have been more to their purpose, than to employ these names for the sake of guiding their readers, had they been at that time affixed to the books. But they have no where employed them. Even when they quote the prophets, it is the name of the *person* who wrote, and not the name of a *book* as such, to which they appeal.

Such is the universal practice of the New Testament writers; and such is that of Clemens Romanus, who wrote during the first century. In writing to the Corinthians, he names, indeed, the epistle of Paul to them; but how could he do otherwise? But in all the numerous quotations which he makes of the other New Testament books, he does not once call any of them by name.

Such facts shew satisfactorily, that the present names of Scriptural books did not then exist; for had they existed, appeal had been made to them, for the same purposes, and from the same necessity, as we now make it every day.

Admitting now that the inscription, *ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίων ἐπιστολή*, is not original, and that it was superadded by some later editor or transcriber of this epistle; it is a very natural and pertinent question, *Why* was such a title given to the epistle in question? The obvious answer must be, because the editor or transcriber, who gave it, supposed that the epistle was intended for the Hebrews.

And whoever the author of the title or inscription was, it is quite certain that he lived at an early period. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt, that he gave such a title to our epistle, as agreed with the general tradition and common opinion of the Christian church at that period. For we find this title, not only in all our present Greek manuscripts, (which would not indeed settle the question of its very remote antiquity,) but in all the early versions, the Syriac, and others; also in the manuscripts of the old Itala, and the ante-Hieronymean Latin versions, the Codex Regius and San Germanensis only excepted. There is, indeed, a catalogue of canonical books from the fragments of an anonymous author, who lived near the close of the second century, (published by Muratori in his *Antiqq. Ital.* Tom. III. p. 854), in which the epistle to the Hebrews is supposed to be called [epistola] *apud Alexandrinos*. But the whole passage of this writer is so obscure, and his ignorance respecting the contents of the epistle to the Hebrews so profound, (as will hereafter be shewn), that nothing is to be abated, on his account, from the statement which has just been exhibited. The fathers of the second century give the same title to our epistle, which it now has; for it is by this name, that Panteus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and Origen, (with the whole series of fathers after them), make their appeal to it. This shews, beyond reasonable doubt, that from whatever source the title arose, it arose *early*, and early became general or rather universal in the church, wherever the epistle was received.

But although the fact is certain, in respect to the *early* origin and currency of this title, one question remains, about which there has been no small dispute among critics. What is the meaning of the word *Hebrews*? Does this name apply only to the Jews of Palestine, who spoke the Hebrew language? Or is it equally applicable to all the descendants of the Hebrews, who lived in foreign countries, and adhered to the Jewish religion? On this question turns the whole evidence to be derived from the title, in respect to the main subject under consideration. If the first be true, then does it shew, that soon after the epistle was written, the church in general believed it to have been directed to the Jews in Palestine; if the second, then it does not at all help to

shew, whether the early church held it to be written to the Christian community of Hebrews in Palestine, or out of it. Viewed in this light, the question as to the meaning of the word *Hebrews* becomes a matter of no inconsiderable importance, and should therefore be radically investigated.

The writers of the New Testament may be fairly presumed to have used the word *Hebrew*, according to the prevailing *usus loquendi* of the times when they wrote ; and in all probability, too, of the time when the title was given to our epistle, which could not be long afterwards. But they have uniformly employed it to designate the Palestine Jews, or those who had imbibed their opinions and spoke their language. In Acts 6: 1, the Palestine Christians are expressly called *Ἑβραῖοι*, in contradistinction from the foreign Jews who are called *Ἑλληνιστῆαι*; *there arose a murmuring of the HELLENISTS against the HEBREWS, because their widows were neglected in the daily administration.* In conformity with this passage, (which is fundamental in the question now under consideration), the dialect of Palestine is repeatedly called *Ἑβραϊκῆ* or *Ἑβραϊκός* in the New Testament ; e. g. Acts 21: 40. 22: 2. Luke 23: 38. John 5: 2. 19: 13, 17. Agreeably to this, *Ἑβραΐζειν* means, *to speak or write Hebrew* ; as Josephus says, *τὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος διήγγειλε Ἑβραΐζων*, Bell. Jud. vi. 2, i. e. *he narrated Cesar's history, in the Hebrew tongue.* To have a knowledge of the Hebrew language, and to speak it, was deemed among the Jews a matter of great importance or a very valuable acquisition, Acts 21: 40. 22: 2. Hence Paul, when speaking of the ground of precedence which he might claim above the false teachers at Philippi, says, that *he is a Hebrew of the Hebrews*, i. e. one of full Hebrew descent, and acquainted with the Hebrew language. Although he was born at Tarsus, he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem, Phil. 3: 5. To this same fact he seems to appeal again, in a similar case, 2 Cor. 11: 22, *Are they Hebrews? So am I.*

With this *usus loquendi* of the New Testament agree other facts, which seem to place the question beyond reasonable doubt, as to what the usage of the apostolic age was, in respect to the meaning of the word in question.

The Hebrew Christians of Palestine early possessed a spurious gospel, which long continued to have currency among them. Universal consent gave to this gospel, written in the Syro-Chaldaic or Palestine dialect of the time, the name *Λύαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίοις*; evidently because it was used or approved by people of Palestine, who spoke the so called Hebrew language. The early fathers, it is well known, drew the conclusion from the title to our epistle, that it was originally written in the Hebrew language. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus asserts, that it was written, *Ἑβραίοις Ἑβραϊκῇ γωνῇ*, and interpreted by others, Euseb. II. Ecc. VI. 14. In the same way, Eusebius declares that it was addressed, *Ἑβραίοις διὰ τῆς πατρίου γλώττης*, to the Hebrews in their native tongue, Hist. Ecc. III. 28; and Jerome says, that Paul wrote, *ut Hebraeus Hebraeis Hebraicè*, i. e. as a Hebrew, to the Hebrews, in the Hebrew language; Catal. Scriptt. verb. Paulus.

Now how could these fathers reason thus, unless they had understood the word *Hebrews* as necessarily meaning, according to the *usus loquendi* of that age, *those who spoke the Hebrew language*?

Bertholdt declares boldly, that not a single example can be found, in early times, of Jewish Christians out of Palestine being called Hebrews, Einleit. p. 2875. I would express my own conviction in a more guarded manner, and say, I have not been able to find any instance where this is the case.

Yet Eichhorn has ventured to assert, that the name *Hebrew* never has any reference to *language*, but always to *religion* or *origin*. His proof is, first, a passage from Eusebius' Hist. Ecc. III. 4, in which the historian asserts, that Peter addressed his epistle, *πρὸς τοὺς ἐξ Ἑβραίων ὄντας ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰόντων*. But this implies simply, that those whom Peter addressed were descended from the Hebrews, or belonged to those of the circumcision. Another passage to which he appeals, is in Philo (de Abrahamo, p. 388 D. edit. Par.), where he says, that Sarah advised Abraham to take as a concubine [Hagar], *who by descent was an Egyptian, τὴν τε προαίρησεν Ἑβραῖον, but by choice a Hebrew*; which he construes as meaning, *who had embraced the religion of the Hebrews*. But the antithesis here does not admit

of this sense. By *descent* she was of the *Egyptian nation*, but by *voluntary choice* she attached herself to the *Hebrew nation*, is plainly the meaning of the passage ; so that it fails altogether in affording ground for the conclusion which Eichhorn adduces from it.

Carpzoff, to whom Eichhorn is indebted for this quotation, has adduced several others, to shew that the word *Hebrew* is used to characterize the *religion* of the Jews, rather than their *language* or *nation*. Exercitt. in Heb. Prolog. c. 1. But so far are they from affording satisfaction to my mind, that I do not think them worthy the labour of an examination in this place.

The result of this inquiry is, then, that *Ἑβραῖοι*, in the inscription to our epistle, means, and according to the *usus loquendi* of the age must mean, *the Hebrews of Palestine*, i. e. Hebrews in a country where the Hebrew language was *vernacular*.

If I have offered sufficient evidence to establish this, then does the title to our epistle go far towards shewing what the original destination of the epistle was. If an ancient epistle has no direction within itself, and contains no unequivocal passages indicative of locality, in what way can we ascertain the original direction of it better than by tradition ? Do we not appeal in all similar cases to tradition, in order to shew when and where authors were born, lived, and wrote ? Where and when books were written ? And seldom, indeed, can we trace back tradition, in a manner so satisfactory and definite, as in the case just considered.

Thus much for the *external* testimony, in regard to the opinion that Palestine was the place to which our epistle was directed ; the voice of antiquity, and the title of the letter, constituting strong presumptive evidence that such was the case. But does the *internal* condition of the epistle itself agree with this ? And does it furnish no objections, which will overbalance the weight of tradition ? Something must be said relative to these questions, before we can make our ultimate conclusion. I proceed then,

(2.) To examine whether the internal condition of the epistle agrees with and confirms the supposition, which I am now endeavouring to defend.

The most superficial reader cannot help being impressed, on a slight reading of this epistle, with the idea that it is addressed to Jewish converts. In respect to this, indeed, all critics, ancient and modern, are of one opinion. But a close examination discloses a peculiarity of appeal, in this epistle, to the Mosaic ritual, which can be found no where else in the New Testament.

In the Acts of the Apostles, and in the acknowledged epistles of Paul, we find, indeed, numerous traces of dispute and difficulty with Jews, who lived in countries remote from Palestine. But the disputed questions turn upon points of circumcision, of meats clean and unclean, points which respected the sabbaths, and the holidays that the Jews had been accustomed to observe. Concerning the priesthood, the temple, and the ritual of sacrifices, we find no questions of difficulty agitated.

The obvious reason of this seems to be, that but very few of the foreign Jews, regularly, or even at all attended the services of the temple. The great body of those who lived in the countries more distant from Palestine, plainly could not attend the feast at Jerusalem three times in each year, according to the prescription of Moses. The time and expenses necessary to do this, could not be spared.

This is not matter of mere conjecture. We know that the most numerous colony of Jews, any where to be found at that period, as well as the most learned and rich, was that at Alexandria in Egypt. Hither they had been transplanted, about 284 years A. C. by Ptolemy Philadelphus, who had overrun Palestine with his army. They were allowed great privileges, under the reign of this prince; so that many were allured to Egypt, in his time, and the number of Jews in that country became quite large. Under Ptolemy Philometor, not far from 175 A. C., Onias, son of the high priest Onias at Jerusalem, who had fled to Egypt for safety, asked leave of Ptolemy and his queen Cleopatra, to build a temple at Leontopolis in that country, which was a town in the Prefecture of Heliopolis. This leave he obtained; and there he built a temple, and constituted priests and Levites as ministers for its services. In his petition for obtaining this liberty, he states, that while on his military expeditions in



the service of the king, he had seen temples used by the Jews for their religious services, in Celosyria, Phenicia and Leontopolis. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. XIII. 6. edit. Colon. Allowing this statement to be true, it would appear, that at least many of these foreign Jews had then already lost their zeal, for attendance on the temple worship at Jerusalem. That the Jews in Egypt did not, in general, attend the feasts at Jerusalem, is well known. They only sent an occasional deputy there, by way of testifying their respect and fraternal sympathy.

If the Jews in Egypt did thus, we may well suppose that the Jews at a greater distance from Palestine, imitated them in their remissness, with respect to attendance on the temple worship at Jerusalem. The nature of the case shews, that as a body they could not have been habitually present at the holy feasts; and that most of them, indeed, never frequented Jerusalem at all. In fact, this city could not have accommodated the one fourth part of the worshippers from abroad, had all the foreign Jews gone up to the feasts held there.

The natural consequence of not being familiar with the temple rites and priesthood, was a diminution of zeal in the foreign Jews, with respect to things of this nature; until, in the end, they became to them matters of minor importance, or even of comparative indifference. Hence, Paul had no disputes with the foreign Jews about these things. At least, no marks of such disputes appear in the history of this apostle by Luke, nor in the letters of Paul himself.

But here is a point, respecting which the epistle to the Hebrews differs widely from all the other epistles of the New Testament. It is not with the question whether circumcision is to be retained or rejected; not with the dispute about meats offered to idols; not with prescriptions about new moons and sabbaths; that the writer is concerned. The whole epistle turns on different subjects. It is the favourite idea of preeminence, so tenaciously attached by zealous Jews to all parts of the Mosaic *ritual*, which the writer discusses. The dignity or rank of those, through whose mediation the law was given; the temple-apartments, furniture, rites, and sacrifices; the order and honour of

the priesthood ; in a word, the whole apparatus of the Levitical service, both daily and annual, are the subjects of which he treats, and the things which he compares with the corresponding parts of the Christian dispensation, in order to shew the superiority of the latter. Were angels employed in order to introduce the law ? Christ, who has obtained a name and place far more exalted than they, himself introduced the new dispensation. Was Moses the beloved and honoured leader of God's chosen people, placed at the head of the Jewish dispensation ? He was placed there as a *servant* ; but Christ, at the head of the new dispensation as a *Son*. Was the high priest of the Jews a mediator between God and the people, who offered up their annual propitiatory sacrifice, and went into the holy of holies, into the immediate presence of the Divinity, on their account ? The office of this high priest, from its very nature and from the brevity of human life, was short and limited : but Christ is high priest *forever* ; he has entered the holy of holies in the highest heavens, and has once for all offered a propitiatory sacrifice of everlasting efficacy. Was the temple a magnificent structure, the sacred character of which inspired awe ? Magnificent and sacred as it was, it was merely a copy of the temple in which Jesus officiates, reared by God himself, and eternal in the heavens. Was the blood of goats and bullocks annually presented before the shrine of Jehovah by the Jewish high priest, on the great day of atonement ? Jesus, by his own blood, entered the sanctuary of the eternal temple, and made an atonement which needs not to be repeated. In a word, were all the implements of temple-service, all which pertained to the order and persons of the priesthood, venerable and holy ? All these things were merely similitudes of the more perfect temple and priesthood of him, who is the great high priest of the Christian dispensation.

Who now were possessed of these *specific* views in respect to the Mosaic ritual, which the writer thus brings into comparison ? To whom could the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews (as he constantly does) appeal, as being familiarly acquainted with every thing that pertained even to the minutest parts of the Jewish ritual, and priesthood, and sacred places, and utensils, and the

very location of these utensils? To whom I ask, but to the Palestine Jews? To those who from childhood were familiar with all these objects, and who had been inspired by education with the most profound reverence for them, and with zeal to maintain their importance?

Why are not these subjects brought into view, in Paul's letters to other churches? Disputes he had with the Jews, as the epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians and Thessalonians, in a word, as all his epistles, testify. But not about the temple ritual, and priesthood, and holy places, and utensils. The disputes concerned other rites of Judaism, which could be generally practised by Hebrews living in foreign countries; and not those, in which only a few devotees would feel a particular interest.

I cannot resist the impression, when I read the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews, that the appeal is made to those, who have an intimate knowledge and strong jealousy for the honour of the whole Mosaic ritual there brought to view. I am fully aware, that pilgrims (so to speak) annually resorted from all parts of the world, where the Jews were settled, to Jerusalem. So they do still. But how few must these have been, from countries more remote. The supposition that the great body of the church, or the whole church, addressed in the epistle to the Hebrews, (if these Hebrews belonged to foreign countries), possessed the intimate personal knowledge of the Jewish ritual, holy places, and utensils, which the writer evidently supposes those to possess whom he addresses, does, in itself considered, seem to be very improbable.

It is rendered still more so, by some additional facts, which ought to be here stated. In the latter part of Paul's ministry, his disputes abroad about Judaism appear to have generally subsided, and he was every where received by the foreign churches with great cordiality and affection. It was only at the first planting of the churches abroad, at the period when the transition was to be made from Judaism to Christianity, (which was indeed a great transition in respect to *externals*), that disputes arose, and passions were awakened, which occasioned much trouble and anxiety to the

apostle. More light, and a better understanding of the nature of Christianity, appeased these disputes, wherever Judaism had not the strong grasp which the *constant* practice of the *ritual* gave it.

Not so in Palestine. The very last visit which the apostle made there, before he was sent a prisoner to Rome, occasioned a tumult among the zealots for the law; who even joined in persecuting him. "Thou seest, brother," said the other apostles to him, "how many thousand Jews are become believers, and they are all *ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου*," *zealots for the observance of the law*, Acts 21: 20; the correctness of which sentiment was abundantly confirmed by the sequel. That the *zealots for the law* here means particularly the Jews of Palestine, is evident from v. 21 which follows.

That the Palestine Christians adhered with far greater tenacity to the Jewish ritual than the Jews abroad, is clearly shewn moreover by the fact, that, while the foreign Jews soon abandoned altogether the rites of Judaism, the zealots for the Mosaic ritual in Palestine even separated, at last, from the community of other Christians, rejected all the epistles of Paul from the canon of the New Testament, and retained in all their strictness the ceremonies of the law. I refer to the sects of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, the first heresies that rent asunder the church of Christ; and which would not bear at all with the catholic spirit of Paul's preaching and epistles.

All these circumstances united, have strongly impressed me with the idea, that the whole texture and manner of the epistle to the Hebrews almost of necessity implies, that those to whom it was originally addressed were habitually attendants on the services of the temple, and intimately and *personally* acquainted with all its rites and ceremonies. Of course, I must regard them as belonging to Palestine, or its near neighbourhood.

In addition to these considerations, which apply generally to the epistle in question, there appear to be some particular references made to circumstances, which would seem to presuppose a personal and familiar knowledge, on the part of those addressed, with objects in and about Jerusalem and the temple. E. g. when the writer says, 13: 12, "Wherefore Jesus, that he might purify

the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate," viz. the gate through which criminals were led to execution. This implies, that the readers were supposed to be acquainted with the *locality* of Jerusalem. And in 9: 5, after recounting the apartments and various sacred utensils of the temple, the writer says, *Concerning which things οὐκ ἔστι, it is not my purpose* [or it is unnecessary] *to speak particularly*; by which there is an appeal made to the knowledge of his hearers, that seems to imply a *local* and *personal* acquaintance with the circle of objects which are designated.

I freely acknowledge these circumstances are not so peculiar and exclusive, that it is not possible to apply them to Jews, who resided abroad and habitually visited Jerusalem. But where was the *community* abroad, who *as a body* did this? And then, *probability* and not *demonstration* is what we seek for, in an argument of this nature. If demonstration, or what is equivalent to it, had been found in the epistle itself, there had not been such endless dispute about it.

It is a striking fact, also, that *only Jews* are addressed throughout the epistle. Where were the churches abroad that consisted only of Jews? I am aware, this argument may be met by asking the question; Could not the writer address the Jewish part of a church abroad, and not the Gentile? The *possibility* of this cannot be denied. The *probability* that it was so, does not, in this case, seem to be very great. For is it not natural to suppose, that the Gentile part of the church would have been more or less infected with the feelings of the Jewish part; and that some of them, at least, would have also been in danger of apostasy? Could the writer, who shews such deep solicitude to prevent this awful catastrophe, fail to have warned his Gentile brethren against their danger; and to have exhorted and encouraged them to persevere? If this be *possible*, we must still grant, when we consider the characteristics of the writer, that it is at least highly *improbable*.

Nor can it be alleged, as an adequate reply to this, that the epistles to the Ephesians and Galatians are exclusively addressed to Gentile converts. For in regard to the first, no such ur-

gent and fundamental question, as that treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews, comes under discussion. It is probable, moreover, that by far the greater part of this church were Gentiles. And with respect to the epistle to the Galatians, although Storr has assumed it as a point which admits of no question, that it is directed to Gentile converts only, yet Noesselt (as we have seen) is of opinion, that it is addressed altogether to Jewish converts, and says, that no one except Beausobre denies this. Opusc. Fascic. I. p. 293. Neither he nor Storr can establish their respective opinions, from the contents of the epistle. Most apparent is it, that, in general, converts from the heathen are addressed. But when the apostle says, Gal. 4: 9, "Why should ye turn *again* to the weak and beggarly elements of the world, to which ye desire *again* to be in bondage," viz. to the Jewish ritual, can he address only converts from the *heathen*? And when he says too, 5: 1, "Be not again entangled in the yoke of bondage," can he address only these who were formerly heathens? An appeal, then, to the epistles addressed to the Ephesians and Galatians, as being *exclusively* addressed to only one part of churches made up of both Jews and Gentiles, is not satisfactory, in the case before us; for the Galatian church is plainly addressed as a mixed body; and the church at Ephesus appears to have been principally made up of Gentiles. It is not comparing *par cum pari*. The peculiar circumstances of which the epistle to the Hebrews treats, shew that a warning to the Gentile part of that church to whom it was sent, if such church were among the Gentiles and consisted in part of them, was a thing to all appearance of indispensable necessity.

Here then is another circumstance, which contributes to render it probable that some church in Palestine was addressed by the epistle to the Hebrews. It is *possible*, that there may have been some churches abroad wholly made up of Jews; but history has given no account of any such; and not only the *possibility* but the *probability* of it must be shewn, before the argument now adduced is deprived of its force.

Again, the persons addressed are requested to "call to mind their sufferings in former days, when they were first enlightened.

and when they took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and suffered other evils from persecution," 10: 32, 34. This, indeed, may *possibly* have been true of other churches abroad ; but we have no historical information of persecutions abroad, in the earliest age of Christianity, which were permitted by the civil government to proceed so far as to destroy or confiscate property, and to imprison persons for any length of time. Palestine was the place for such occurrences, from the very first. I am aware that Paul went with a commission to Damascus, that he might cast Christians into prison. But the very terms of that commission, directed him to bring those whom he should apprehend "bound to Jerusalem," Acts 9: 2. Indeed, it is plainly the case, that at this period the Roman magistracy every where abroad opposed persecution ; for it was contrary to the established maxims of the Roman government, to intermeddle with the religion of their provinces. Often did this magistracy interfere, to protect Christians whom the violence of the Jews had assailed ; Acts 18: 12—17. 19: 35—40. Acts XXI. etc. Still, I have admitted, that it is *possible* such early persecution, as the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of, may have taken place abroad ; but this has not been rendered *probable*, by producing any historical records which testify to it. The solitary instance of Antipas at Pergamos, Rev. 2: 13, is the only one I have been able to find. In all probability, he, like Stephen, was destroyed by the rage of a lawless mob. Of course, until more evidence on this subject can be produced, the argument from the passage in our epistle, which has been just cited, adds no inconsiderable weight to the evidence in favour of the supposition which I am endeavouring to defend.

(3.) If it can be rendered probable that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, I should think it almost certain, that it must have been written to Jews in Palestine ; for throughout the whole epistle, there is not one word which shews the writer to have been the instrument of their conversion, or even to have been their religious teacher. What church abroad could be thus addressed by Paul ? For what one had not been either planted or nurtured by him ? I do not deny the possibility of there hav-

ing been some one ; but the evidence that there actually was, at the time when our epistle was written, I have not been able to find.

And besides this, it is peculiar to the epistle to the Hebrews, that not one word is said, which implies that their teachers were lacking in any thing, pertaining either to the knowledge or the duties demanded by their office. All is commendation. How natural is this, and easy to be accounted for, if these teachers were apostles or immediate disciples of Christ himself ; and such were the teachers of the churches in Palestine. On the whole, this is a circumstance which increases the probability of the opinion that I am assaying to defend.

Internal evidence, then, is not wanting, which accords with the testimony given by the inscription of the epistle to the Hebrews. Indeed, the concurrence of both kinds of evidence is such, as to afford grounds of probability as strong as could be expected in regard to a question of this nature, which respects a matter so ancient and so difficult. Direct and positive proof, incapable of being in any way questioned or contradicted, can neither be required nor justly expected. But there is evidence enough, as it appears to me, to render the opinion of the ancient church, that the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Christians in Palestine, altogether probable.

Objections, however, drawn from the epistle itself, against this opinion, have been often and strongly urged by critics of late ; and these cannot, with due respect to the authors of them, be passed over in silence.

OBJECTION 1. ‘ Heb. 2: 3, “ How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him.” From this passage it appears, that Christ had not personally taught those to whom this epistle is addressed ; they had only been instructed by *those who heard him*, viz. the apostles and immediate disciples of Christ.’

It is remarkable that this same verse is adduced and relied on, by Lardner, to support the opinion that the Hebrews of Palestine only could have been addressed by it ; and by Storr, to



prove that those could *not* have been the persons addressed. The argument is equally valid in both cases, i. e. it amounts to nothing in either. For the simple sentiment of the text is, 'How can we escape punishment, if we neglect the gospel first published by the Lord of glory in person, and then abundantly confirmed by miracles which were wrought by the apostles and immediate disciples of Christ.'

Now this might be said to any church of that period, in any country ; and to any church on earth, from that period down to the present hour. Of course, it determines nothing relative to the question, whether our epistle was directed to a church in, or out of Palestine.

OBJECTION 2. 'Heb.12: 4, "Ye have not resisted unto blood, striving against sin," i. e. against injurious and unjust opposition. How could this be said to the church at Jerusalem, which had been called to witness the martyrdom of Stephen and others, and the bloody death of James ; and who had lived in the fire of persecution, ever since its first establishment ?'

This argument has appeared so conclusive to many critics, that they have abandoned the idea of supporting the ancient opinion, that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine. Its first appearance inclined me to the same conclusion. A more particular examination of it, however, has led me to doubt altogether of its validity.

"Call to mind," says the writer, "your severe afflictions in former days, when ye were first enlightened," 10: 32—34. That is, your former persecutions, which were severe, ye bore with patience and cheerfulness, although ye suffered imprisonment and loss of property. Now, indeed, ye are tried, continues the writer, but not in the highest degree. "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood." How then does the history of the church in Palestine comport with this sentiment ? A question which must necessarily be investigated here.

The first persecution was that which arose at the time of Stephen's martyrdom, Acts vi. vii. This happened probably in A. D. 37 or 38. During this persecution, many were imprisoned, severely beaten, and subjected to various insults and outrages.

ges ; but there is no satisfactory evidence, that any blood was shed except that of Stephen. Paul, in giving an account of his former conduct, says that he persecuted Christianity unto death, Acts 22: 4, which was in fact the case with respect to Stephen ; and no doubt he designed to do so, in respect to many others. But in telling us what he actually effected, he says, that he arrested Christians, beat them in the synagogues, Acts 22: 4, 19, compelled them to blaspheme, and shut them up in prison, Acts 26: 10, 11. But the voice of Jesus arrested him, on his way to Damascus ; and in confessing his crime, he avows that he imprisoned believers and beat them in the synagogues. But he does not state that he was guilty of blood, except in the case of Stephen, Acts 22: 19, 20. As this passage contains, we have reason to believe, a *full* confession of his guilt, it may serve to explain the doubtful passage in Acts 26: 10, where he says, *when they were slain* (*ἀραιγουμένων ἀνιῶν*), *I gave my vote against them.* The plural number here (*ἀραιγουμένων*) has led many to suppose, that Paul was concerned in *frequent* murders. But any one versed in the narrations of the New Testament, cannot but know how frequently the plural number is used to designate the occurrence of facts, in which *only one* person is concerned, i. e. where the sense of the passage requires it to be understood, only as in the singular. It is thus that the thieves on the cross are said to have reviled the Saviour, although *only one* of them did so, Matt. 27: 44. Mark 15: 32, comp. Luke 23: 39 ; thus that the demoniacs at Gadara are said to have been exceedingly fierce, when *only one* of them was so, Matt. 8: 28—34, comp. Mark 5: 1—18. Luke 8: 26—38 ; and thus, in other cases presented by the Scriptures,\* and (I may add) by other writings also, too numerous to be here recounted. Nothing is said, in the history of the first persecution, of any Christians suffering martyrdom besides Stephen. Nothing in Paul's confession to the Saviour, which specifies the blood that he had shed. The conclusion seems to be, then, that only the blood of Stephen was shed,

---

\* See Matt. 20: 30—34, and comp. Mark 10: 46—52. 18: 35—43. See also Matt. 28: 1. Mark 16: 1, 2, with which comp. Luke 24: 1, 9, 10, and John 20: 1, 11, 13.

on this occasion, although doubtless Paul then *meant* to add to the number of martyrs; he gave his vote for this purpose, Acts. 26: 10, and abused Christians in various ways, such as the spite and malice of Jews suggested. But they were not *destroyed*. It must be remembered, in regard to this persecution, that it was limited to *Jerusalem*; with the exception only that Paul *designed* to extend it to *Damascus*, Acts 8: 12. 26: 10.

Saul's conversion, however, appears to have put an end to this persecution; for we read, after his first visit to Jerusalem, that the churches in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, were in a state of peace and prosperity, and were multiplied, Acts 9: 31.

Persecution again broke out under Herod Agrippa, (about A. D. 44), who, to gain favour with the Jews, pretended great zeal for the law; and to do them a pleasure, undertook to harass Christians. How widely he extended his efforts to vex them, the sacred historian has not told us; it is simply said, that he undertook *κακῶσαι τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, and that he put to death James the brother of John, and cast Peter into prison, Acts 12: 1, 3. It is very probable, since Herod lived a part of his time at Cesarea, that he may have extended his vexations to the churches there, in order to increase his popularity in that city, which was the capital of his kingdom. Be this as it may, we read of only one death on this occasion; *James he destroyed, ἀνεῖλε*; but others, *ἐκάκωσε*. This persecution happened so early, as A. D. 44.

Herod died a short time after this, at Cesarea, smitten by a divine hand on account of his having impiously received praise as a God. With his death, the persecution ceased; for the Roman procurators who followed, allowed of no open persecution. It was not until the departure of Festus, and before the arrival of his successor Albinus, (nineteen or twenty years after the persecution of Herod), that the Jews were again engaged in any open or violent outrages against Christians. James the younger, and some others with him, were then destroyed by Ananus the high priest. But this act of violence was disapproved by the considerate and sober part of the Jews; and Ananus himself was thrust out of office, by the interference of the succeeding Roman gov-

error, on account of this act of cruelty, Josephus Antiq. XX. These are all the persecutions unto blood, in Palestine and before the destruction of Jerusalem, of which we have any historical information. The last of these probably occurred, after the epistle to the Hebrews was written. Vexation proceeding from personal insult, contumely, excommunications, malice, and blind fiery zeal, on the part of the unbelieving Jews, no doubt, the Christians in Palestine suffered very frequently, during the period before the destruction of Jerusalem. But restraint of personal liberty, and destruction of property or of life, were not permitted by the Roman government, while the civil administration of Judea was actually in their hands.

Compare now these facts, (which I have not seen fully developed by any of the critics who have written on our epistle), with the passage which is at present under consideration. Our epistle is directed to Christians as a body, and not to the *teachers* or *officers* of the churches; for these are separately spoken of, Heb. 13: 7, 17, and a salutation is sent to them Heb. 13: 24, as not being a party to the epistle, but a separate class of persons. The investigation which we have instituted shows that *only teachers*, and not *private Christians*, had suffered martyrdom in Judea. An epistle to private Christians in Palestine, then, and not addressed to their teachers, might say, and might truly say, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin;" although some of their *teachers* had suffered martyrdom.

Eichhorn, denying that our epistle was written to a church in Palestine, asks, as though it were incapable of contradiction, "Did not blood often flow at Jerusalem, and (since this was the metropolis of the country) in Palestine at large?" And then he concludes it to be impossible, that our epistle should say to Hebrew Christians in Palestine, "Ye have not resisted unto blood." But had he minutely investigated the history of these persecutions, he might have spared his conclusion, and refrained from the assurance with which it is stated. If, however, we should admit all that is contended for, viz. that in the persecution of the time of Stephen, and under Herod Agrippa, many *private Christians* were destroyed: even then, the passage of the epistle,

which we are considering, offers no formidable difficulty. Plainly the principles of interpretation demand no more, than that what is said, in the verse under consideration, should have respect to the generation of Christians *then living*, and the persecution *then pending*, when the epistle was written. One generation of Christians, who were adults, or in advanced life when they were converted, (which might have been on or near the day of Pentecost), must have necessarily passed off the stage, in a period of almost thirty years. But many of the generation now addressed may have been Christians, and probably were so, at the time when Herod persecuted the church; which accords well with what our epistle says, "Remember former days, when soon after your conversion, ye endured a great fight of afflictions," 10: 32—34. But after that, when Herod was dead, there was a remission of severities. Now again, the violence of the Jews had begun to shew itself; but the Roman government overawed it, so as to restrain it from shedding blood. Such a state of things agrees well with the language of our epistle. *Ye have not, i. e. in your present struggle, resisted unto blood.* This expression has not *necessarily* any respect to preceding times of persecution, but only to that which was then pending. In this way the laws of exegesis are satisfied. But if not, if the expression must be referred to past times, it is, as we have already seen, capable of historical vindication, when applied to the Hebrews. Private persons had not resisted unto blood.

My apology for dwelling so long on this subject, is, the interesting facts in the history of the church with which it is connected; and the hasty conclusions, or imperfect investigations respecting it, which I have found in all the writers whom I have had opportunity to consult. Even Schroeckh, in his great work on Ecclesiastical History, has omitted any detailed account of the primitive persecutions, and has given us nothing which is adapted to satisfy a particular inquirer.

OBJECTION 3. 'Heb. 13: 24, *They of Italy salute you.* What did the church in Italy know of the church in Palestine, that they should send salutations to them? Or if, as most critics have averred, *they of Italy* means Priscilla and Aquila, how

should the church of Palestine know any thing of these private Jews, who had only travelled from Rome to Corinth, from Corinth to Ephesus, and thence back again to Rome ?

In regard to the first part of this objection, it is sufficient to ask, How could Peter send a salutation from the church at Babylon, 1 Peter 5: 13, to the churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia? 1 Peter 1: 1. How could Paul, writing to the Corinthians from Ephesus, say, "*The churches of Asia salute you?*" 1 Cor. 16: 19. Was then the church at Babylon *personally* acquainted with all those churches in Asia, to whom their salutation is sent by Peter? Or were the churches of Asia *personally* acquainted with the Corinthians? Neither the one, nor the other. Neither was necessary; for what is more common than salutations, sent by a mutual friend, from some persons to others whom they have never seen?

But farther; had *they of Italy* never heard of the church in Palestine? And might they not sympathize with them in their trials and dangers, and send them an affectionate expression of their regard in a salutation? Such objections cannot surely help to support the cause, in aid of which they are adduced.

As to Aquila, and Priscilla, (if the *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* means them, which is very improbable), a sympathy in them, as Jews, for their Christian brethren in Palestine, is surely not a matter of wonder. And an expression of this in a salutation, is as little so.

† OBJECTION 4. 'The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, has in various places eulogized them for the charity which they had so cheerfully manifested, and continued to manifest, on various occasions, Heb. 6: 10; in particular for their compassion towards those who were in bonds, i. e. imprisoned, 10: 32 seq. He exhorts them also to continue their benefactions of this nature, by a liberal hospitality, Heb. 13: 1, 2 and 16. How could such things be addressed to the church in Palestine; and how could that be praised for contributions to others, when they were so poor, from the first, that they had even been assisted by the contributions of churches from abroad?'

But this argument fails of producing conviction, because it is

built on an interpretation of the epistle which is not admissible, and on an assumption of facts altogether improbable and unsupported. The writer tells them, that God will not forget their labour of love, in that they have ministered to the saints, and do still minister, 6: 10; that they have had compassion on those who were in bonds, 10: 34; that they must not forget to entertain strangers, 13: 2; and that God is well pleased with their sacrifices of hospitality (*ξενωτίας*), 13: 16. Here is nothing said, or even intimated, of making contributions for churches abroad. They are commended for being liberal to the saints, who were in need or in prison; and exhorted to continue their hospitality to strangers, i. e. to receive with liberality and kindness brethren that were strangers from abroad (probably preachers), who visited them. Who can doubt that a characteristic, so peculiarly exhibited by Christians in general of the primitive age, was manifested by the churches in Palestine? a country which so many strangers visited.

But when it is said, that the church in Palestine was supported by contributions from abroad, why should this be predicated, as it is by many critics, of *all* the Christian churches in Palestine? There is no support for this opinion to be derived from history. When the famine occurred in the time of Claudius, Acts 11: 27—30, a collection was made at Antioch, and sent to Judea; which appears, however, to have been distributed at Jerusalem, Acts 12: 25. In respect to all the other collections mentioned in Paul's epistles, Jerusalem is evidently the place for which they were destined. See Rom. 15: 25—31. 1 Cor. 16: 1—3. 2 Cor. viii. ix. *εἰς ἁγίους*; comp. 1 Cor. 16: 1—3. Gal. 2: 1—10. If now we consider the circumstances of the church at Jerusalem, this will not excite any surprise. For first, in this metropolis Jewish zeal was more displayed than elsewhere, and Christians here were, of course, peculiarly exposed to persecution and want. Secondly, the multitude of Christian Jews, who still resorted to the temple in order to pay their services there, and who would naturally consort with the Christians at Jerusalem, rendered necessary the charity of the churches abroad, in order that the Christians of the Jewish metropolis might support

their hospitality. But as to other churches in Palestine, we know nothing of their poverty. We know that many Christians in that country had possessions, and sold them in order to put the avails into the public treasury of the church, soon after the day of Pentecost, Acts 2: 44, 45. Indeed, it is beyond all the bounds of probability, to suppose that of the many thousand Jews in Palestine, who had become Christians, *all* were poor and in need of foreign charity. Poverty of this nature was not very common among the Jews, who were always an active and industrious nation. Above all, the supposition that the Hebrew Christians were unable to perform the common rites of hospitality, and to aid in any way such as were thrown into prison, or to furnish them with aliment, is destitute of every degree of probability; and therefore it can form no solid objection to the idea, that the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to some church or churches in Palestine. Why is it necessary to suppose that the church at Jerusalem, and that *exclusively*, was addressed?

Moreover, the very objection itself affords an argument for the position which it is designed to oppose. In what country were the *prisoners* to whom compassion had been shewn? Prisoners they were, evidently, on account of their Christian faith. We have seen that neither liberty nor life, were, at this period, in jeopardy abroad, on account of religion, because of the restraint over the Jews exercised by the Roman government. We have no history that proves such jeopardy to have been matter of fact. The mere temporary imprisonment of Paul and Silas, on charge of sedition, and as preparatory to trial (Acts xvi.), proves nothing to the purpose. Accounts of other imprisonments besides this, out of Palestine, cannot be shewn in the history of the primitive church, at least within the Roman provinces abroad. Palestine was the only place where Christians were imprisoned. Even when Paul went to Damascus, he expected to bring his prisoners to Jerusalem, Acts 9: 2. *Palestine* then was the place, where compassion to Christian prisoners was needed, and where it was to be shewn; and there, as it seems to me, it was exhibited by those whom the epistle to the Hebrews addresses.

OBJECTION 5. ‘Heb. 13: 23. “Know ye that our brother Ti-



mothy is *set at liberty*, ἀπολελιμένον, with whom, if he come soon, I will pay you a visit." How could the church in Palestine know any thing of Timothy, who was never there; and what particular concern can they be supposed to have had with a visit of Timothy to them ?

But, first, it is altogether probable that Timothy was with Paul at Jerusalem, during his last visit there, before his imprisonment. It is certain from Acts 20: 4, that Timothy set out with him and several others, from Troas, to go to Jerusalem; and equally certain, that although the history of Paul's voyage to Palestine, at that time, is traced with a minuteness that is unusual, not a word is mentioned of Timothy's being left behind, or being separated for any time from him; although it is the custom of Luke to mention such a fact, whenever it occurs; e. g. Acts 19: 22. 17: 14. 20: 5, 13, 14. Indeed, it is altogether against probability, that Timothy would have separated from Paul, on this occasion; as it was announced to Paul, on his way, that bonds and imprisonment awaited him at Jerusalem, Acts 21: 4. 20: 23; not to mention the desire which Timothy, who had been educated as a Jewish proselyte, must have had to see Jerusalem and the interesting objects which it presented.

The sequel of this journey was, that Paul was kept two years as a prisoner at Cesarea; with full liberty of access, however, to all his friends and acquaintance. Is there any probability that Timothy, who was so ardently attached to Paul, as to have followed him every where, from the very first of his acquaintance with him, would have now immediately deserted him; or even if he was then abroad, that he would not have come to aid his necessities? So far then as the objection is built on Timothy's ignorance of the Jews in Palestine, or theirs of him, it appears altogether improbable.

Besides, even supposing Timothy had not been personally there, did not the churches there know that he was the favourite companion and helper of Paul? And was he not commended to the Jews, by the *fact* that after he became a Christian, he had submitted to the rite of circumcision on their account? If Paul wrote the epistle in question, or any other person intimately con-

nected with Timothy, he might very naturally give the churches in Palestine, and specially the church at Cesarea, information that he was *sent away* (*ἀπολελυμένον*), or *set at liberty*, and that when he should return, he would pay them a visit in his company.

OBJECTION 6. ‘But how could Paul pray to be *restored* to the churches in Palestine? Hebrews 13: 19. He had just been sent to Rome as a prisoner, by the persecuting spirit of the Jews of Palestine; how could he expect or wish to return thither again?’

This objection is built on the assumption, that Paul was the author of our epistle. Conceding this point then, for the sake of argument, it may be asked, in reply, If Paul had been at Rome, and was dismissed there by the emperor himself, on an appeal to him personally as judge in respect to the Jews, might not the apostle well expect that the Jews would in future be overawed, and not venture to attack him again on account of his religion. Besides, it was only at *Jerusalem*, that he was exposed to dangerous persecution. At Cesarea, he remained a kind of prisoner at large, without any tumult or excitement, for two whole years. Might he not desire to be restored to the brethren *there*, who had treated him in a friendly manner, and administered to his necessities while he was among them as a prisoner? Besides, Paul was not a man to be deterred from a desire to go, or from actually going, to any place where he thought it his duty to go, by any prospect of persecution or of sufferings; as his history abundantly testifies.

OBJECTION 7. ‘The Ebionites, a sect made up of Palestine Jews, appear to have known nothing of the epistle to the Hebrews. How could this be, if it had been directed to any of the churches in Palestine?’

If Paul was the author of this epistle, then it is very easy to answer this objection; for the Ebionites rejected all the epistles of Paul from their canon, (as Eusebius expressly testifies), because Paul every where appears in them, wherever occasion demands it, in opposition to a Judaizing spirit. They, on the other hand, separated from other Christians, out of zeal for the rites of the

Jewish law. Nay, the manner in which Eusebius mentions this fact, seems to imply that the Ebionites were acquainted with the epistle to the Hebrews, and rejected it, together with Paul's acknowledged epistles; for Eusebius reckoned this epistle to be certainly one of Paul's; and he mentions the rejection of Paul's epistles by these sectarians, in a manner which seems to imply, that the *whole* of these epistles, as reckoned by himself, were rejected by them.\*

To the same purpose Irenaeus testifies, *Advers. Haeres. I. 26*, "Apostolum Paulum [Ebionitae] recusant, apostatam eum legis dicentes."

Moreover, if some other person, and not Paul, had been the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, the sentiments which it contains respecting the Jewish ritual, would have occasioned its rejection from the canon of the Ebionites. That they did not retain it, then, as part of their New Testament Scriptures, is no argument against its having been directed to the church in Palestine.

OBJECTION 8. 'But if the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to the church in Palestine, why was it not written in the dialect of that country, instead of the Greek language? Is it not improbable, that any writer would address, in Greek, Jews who spoke the Hebrew language?'

There are critics, both of ancient and modern times, who maintain that the original epistle was in Hebrew; believing, as Jerome says, that the author, *ut Hebraeus, Hebraeis Hebraicè scripsit*. But as I am not persuaded of the correctness of this

---

\* Eusebius (*Hist. Ecc. III. 27*) says, that *the Ebionites rejected ALL Paul's epistles, because they believed him to be an apostate from the law, οὗτοι δὲ τοῦ μὲν ἀποστόλου πάσας τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀρνητέας ἠγοῦντο εἶναι δεῖν, ἀποστάτην ἀποκαλοῦντες αὐτὸν τοῦ νόμου*. Now as, in *L. III. 25* of the same author, the epistle to the Hebrews is implicitly reckoned as one of Paul's epistles, and clearly as one of the books of Scripture which are ὁμολογούμενοι, *comp. Lib. III. 25 and III. 3*, it appears that Eusebius means to say, that the Ebionites rejected the epistle to the Hebrews; for he undoubtedly held this to be one of Paul's. Of course, he supposes the Ebionites to have been acquainted with it, or to have had opportunity of being acquainted with it.

opinion, I will not advance it here, as a reply to the objection which we are now considering.

It is well known, and abundantly evident from the writings of the New Testament, that the Greek language was generally understood over all hither Asia. The conquests of Alexander and the governments established by him, had made Greek the language of courts, of literature, and of all well informed people. In the larger and more commercial towns, this knowledge extended in some measure to the common people, as well as to those of a more elevated rank.\*

The Greek votaries, who went up to Jerusalem every year to perform their religious services there, must have rendered the Greek language somewhat current in this metropolis. It was the language by which all the inhabitants of western Asia, when they met as strangers, held intercourse with one another. If the epistle to the Hebrews, then, was written in Greek, and directed to the church at Jerusalem, it *might* have been understood by them.

But if the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Cesarea, there is still more reason to suppose it would have been easily understood there. In that city, there were a great multitude of Greeks, even a majority of its inhabitants, Joseph. Bell. Jud. III. 14. p. 854. edit. Colon., πλέον ἕφ' Ἑλλήνων ἐποικουμένην. The Jews who lived there were, in general, men devoted to commerce, or to concerns of a public nature, and must have well understood the Greek language. No serious difficulty, then, lies in the way of supposing this epistle to have been sent to some part of *Palestine*, and that it was intelligible there, although written in the Greek language.

On the other hand, is it not apparent, that the author of our epistle designed it should be *encyclical*, so that Jews far and near might ultimately peruse it, in order that they might become weaned from their attachment to the Levitical rites, and substitute Christianity in the place of the Mosaic religion? Such a design would have been in some measure defeated, by writing it in Hebrew; for Greek was by far the most general language.

---

\* See this subject illustrated, in a very able and satisfactory manner, by Hug, in his *Einleit. in das N. Test. Theil II.* § 10.

Taking all these facts into view, that it was written in Greek, does not appear to constitute any solid objection to its having been directed to some part of Palestine.

OBJECTION 9. ‘ How could this epistle have been directed to Palestine, when the ground of argument in it, in several places, is furnished by the *Septuagint* version, and not by the Hebrew Scriptures? How could Jews in *Palestine* be convinced, by an appeal of this nature?’

But who does not know, that the Palestine Jews of that day regarded the *Septuagint* version as being of divine authority? Josephus gives full credit to the account of Aristeas, respecting the miraculous manner in which this version was made; as may be seen in his *Antiq.* XII. 2. edit. Colon. There could be no danger, that the Jews of Palestine would object to such an appeal, or to such a mode of argument.

#### RESULT.

I have now examined all the objections against the opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Palestine, with which I have met, and which seem to be of sufficient magnitude to deserve attention. I am unable to perceive that they are very weighty; and surely they come quite short of being *conclusive*. On the other hand, the positive proof, I acknowledge, is only of a circumstantial nature, and falls short of the weight which direct and unequivocal testimony in the epistle itself would possess. But uniting the whole of it together; considering the intimate knowledge of Jewish rites, the strong attachment to their ritual, and the special danger of defection from Christianity in consequence of it, which the whole texture of the epistle necessarily supposes, and combining these things with the other circumstances above discussed, I cannot resist the impression, that the universal opinion of the ancient church respecting the persons to whom our epistle was addressed, was well founded, being built upon early tradition and the contents of the epistle; and that the doubts and difficulties thrown in the way by modern and recent critics, are not of sufficient importance to justify us, in relinquish-

ing the belief that Palestine Christians were addressed by the epistle to the Hebrews. Thousands of facts, pertaining to criticism and to history, are believed and treated as realities, which have less support than the opinion that has now been examined.

There remains but one question more, relative to the original destination of this epistle, concerning which inquiry is now to be made.

§ 11. *Was it directed to ALL the churches in Palestine, or only to ONE? And if only to one, was this the church at Jerusalem, or at some other place?*

This question cannot be answered, as is sufficiently evident from what has been already said, by adducing any *direct* testimony concerning it. *Probability*, made out from circumstantial evidence, is all, at the most, which criticism can achieve. Perhaps it may fail, even in respect to this.

While engaged in the investigations necessary to complete the views above presented, it often occurred to me as not improbable, that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally directed to the church at Cesarea. The reasons of this I will now briefly state.

Cesarea, *Καϊσάρεια παράλιος*, *Cesarea by the sea*, was built by Herod the Great, in a most splendid manner, and named by him in honour of the Roman emperor Augustus. Previously to this, it was an insignificant village, called *Στρατώνιος πύργος*, *the tower of Strato*. Although it lay out of the district of Judea, (as *anciently* defined by the Jews), and within the borders of Phenicia, yet it was within the Roman procuratorship of Judea, and was the capital of the Roman prefects or procurators. Josephus calls it "the greatest city of *Judea*," and says, (as has been already mentioned), that *the majority of the inhabitants were Greeks*, Bell. Jud. III. 14. p. 854. edit. Colon.

Here Cornelius, the first convert to the Christian faith from the Gentiles, was stationed. On occasion of his conversion, a church was gathered here, and the miraculous gifts of the Spirit

imparted to it, Acts 10: 44—48. This was the earliest church, that was gathered out of the ancient limits of Judea.

Paul had repeated opportunities for acquaintance with Christians here. After his first journey to Jerusalem, he returned to Tarsus, through Cesarea, Acts 9: 30. After preaching at Corinth, and on going to revisit the churches in Asia, Paul landed here, Acts 18: 22. On his fourth visit to Palestine, he lodged here at the house of Philip the Evangelist, one of the seven deacons, named in Acts vi. Here he abode *many days*, *ἡμέρας πλείους*, Acts 21: 8—10. Here, at the time just mentioned, when Agabus had predicted, that in case Paul went to Jerusalem he would be bound as a culprit there, and delivered up to the heathen tribunals, the men of the place (*οἱ ἐντόπιοι*), as well as his own travelling companions, besought him with tears and strong entreaties to refrain from going thither, Acts 21: 12, 13.

When, after this, he had been up to Jerusalem, and was sent away under a guard of Roman soldiers, he was brought again to Cesarea; where he remained *two whole years* a kind of prisoner at large, none of his friends being forbidden to approach or assist him, Acts 24: 23, 27.

At Cesarea, dwelt a rich and powerful body of Jews. In the time of Felix, these Cesarean Jews, boasting of their riches and of Herod as the founder of the city, treated with contempt the Syrian part of the population. This raised a tumult, and at last occasioned mutual assaults, in which the Syrians were worsted. Felix was obliged to check the overbearing power of the Jewish party, by commissioning the Roman soldiery to kill and plunder them, Antiq. Jud. XX. 6. p. 695, edit. Colon.

The Jews here, it appears also, were strong zealots for the temple worship. Herod Agrippa, while king of Judea, very probably in order to ingratiate himself with the rich men of this his capital, as well as with those of Jerusalem, pretended a very strong zeal for Judaism. This he exhibited, by causing James the brother of John to be slain with the sword, by imprisoning Peter, and vexing others of the church, Acts 12: 1 seq. Now considering that Cesarea was his capital, and that to ingratiate himself with the Jews there, who were rich and powerful, would

be a great object for a prince so wholly devoted as he was to the interests of ambition ; is it probable that his vexations of the church were limited to Jerusalem ?

Let us now put all these facts together, and compare them with the contents of our epistle, on the supposition that Paul wrote it. From the epistle to the Hebrews it no where appears, that the *writer* was the *first* teacher of the church whom he addresses, but the contrary is plainly implied. Now history tells us that Peter planted the church at Cesarea, and not Paul, Acts x. The teachers of the church addressed in the epistle to the Hebrews, are applauded without any exception as to their doctrine or behaviour ; and so this might well be, for the first teachers at Cesarea were apostles and primitive evangelists. Philip the evangelist was stationed there, when Paul made his last visit to Jerusalem, Acts 21: 8 seq. ; and this Philip had four daughters, who were prophetesses, i. e. teachers of the Christian religion. Does not this shew a flourishing state of the church there ? The persons to whom the epistle to the Hebrews is addressed, had often bestowed charity to relieve the necessities of Christians, and particularly of those who were imprisoned, Heb. 10: 34. 6: 10. How aptly this fits the circumstances of Paul among the Cesareans, it is easy to perceive. He was a prisoner among them for the space of two years. Well might he say, “Ye had compassion *τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, on my bonds,*” as the common text reads ; or (which comes after all to the same thing) *τοῖς δεσμοῖς, on the imprisoned.* Paul’s gratitude for this, probably led him to speak of it repeatedly ; and so it stands in the epistle to the Hebrews. The eulogy, which the writer of that epistle bestows on those whom he addresses, certainly becomes very significant, on supposition that it was written by Paul under such circumstances.

The Hebrews addressed in our epistle had been early made converts to Christianity, 5: 12. 10: 32. The church at Cesarea was the first gathered out of the ancient limits of Judea. Its first converts, indeed, were Gentile proselytes, Acts x. ; but it cannot with any probability be supposed, that, flourishing as it was when Paul paid his last visit to it before his imprisonment, Acts



21: 8. seq., there were no Jews who belonged to it ; for Cesarea contained (as we have seen) a large number of Hebrew residents. Herod Agrippa persecuted the church in A. D. 44, which was some twenty years before the epistle to the Hebrews was written ; and Cesarea was Herod's capitol. May not the Christians in it have suffered at that time ? The Hebrews, in our epistle, had lost their property in some early persecution, and had been imprisoned, 10: 32 seq. ; and the persecuting Herod who had the power of life and death, had also the power of confiscation and imprisonment ; for he was made a *sovereign* by the Roman emperor. Under him the church at Cesarea may have experienced, and very probably did experience, such vexations. Certainly the church at Jerusalem experienced them at this time, Act 12: 1 seq.

The epistle to the Hebrews presents images drawn from the Grecian games and public shows, 10: 32. 12: 1 seq. At Cesarea, Herod the Great had instituted all the Grecian games, and built a splendid theatre ; so that such allusions would be very forcible and pertinent, if addressed to those who lived there. The writer of our epistle mentions Timothy, to the church whom he addresses, as his special friend, and one in whom they would feel a deep interest ; and as Timothy, it cannot well be doubted, was at Cesarea with Paul more or less of the time that he was a prisoner there for two years, the church at that place must have been well acquainted with him. Paul requests their prayers, that he himself may be restored to them, 13: 19 ; and the frequent visits which he had made the Cesareans, the strong attachment they had manifested to him, and the long residence he had made among them, correspond well with a request so plainly founded in their affectionate regard for him, and in his for them.

Again, Cesarea was only two day's journey from Jerusalem, and the Jews there were zealots for the traditions of their fathers. Resistance to the Roman power, which finally brought on the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, first began here, from the wounded spirit of Jewish pride and national feeling. These facts render it probable, that the Jews there had a full and intimate acquaintance with all the Mosaic ritual ; and that

the Christian Jews must, from the power, wealth, and overbearing spirit of the others, have been hard pressed, (by persecution on the one hand, and the imposing pomp of the temple service on the other), to make defection from the Christian religion. Finally, as the majority of the inhabitants here were Greeks, and of course the current language in this splendid capital was Greek, this may account for it, that our epistle was written in Greek instead of the Palestine dialect. From this place, it could not fail to be circulated abroad, as there must have been comers and goers to and from this place, from all parts of Palestine. For Paul to subscribe his name to the epistle was not *necessary*, in case he sent it by a friend, as doubtless he must have done; and besides this, the circumstances mentioned in it, of being restored to them, and of coming to them with Timothy, would be sufficient of themselves to disclose the author to the Cesarean Christians. And designed, as the letter in all probability was, to be a circular among the Jews, they who were abroad, reading it without the name of the author, would not so readily have those prejudices awakened, which had lately shewn themselves to be very violent among the Jews who were zealous for the honour of the Mosaic law, whenever Paul had made his appearance among them.

I grant, at once, that all this is *supposition*. But in the absence of all positive testimony, if a supposition can be presented, which contains nothing improbable in itself, and explains a variety of characteristic passages in our epistle, and accords well with the facts which history has recorded, may it not be received, at least, as a *probability*, until the fallacy of it be exposed, or a more probable one is advanced.

The points of coincidence just recited, forced themselves upon me, unsought and unexpected, in the course of my investigation. They are not offered from the love of novelty, nor with any overweening confidence as to the approbation which others may give them.

One objection to the view here given seems to be, that the church at Cesarea, in the time of Origen and Eusebius, (both of whom lived there), do not appear to have retained a tradition that

our epistle was directed to them. At least, neither of these fathers, so far as I know, make mention of such a tradition ; which they probably might have done, had it existed in their times. Still, if our epistle was designed to be a *circular*, and for that reason, a direction to any particular church was omitted in it, the Cesarean church, if they were the *first* who received it, might not have considered it appropriately theirs, in the same manner as the Corinthians, Galatians, and others, did the letters addressed to them.

Another objection to the idea, that our epistle was directed to the church at Cesarea, may be drawn from the probability, that the church there must have consisted, in fact, of Gentiles ; especially as Greeks constituted a majority of the population of that city. What was really fact, however, in regard to this, at the time when the epistle was written, we have no historical means of ascertaining. It is certainly a very possible case, that, at the time when the epistle to the Hebrews was written, the church at Cesarea might have been principally made up of Jews ; or at least have contained a majority of members, who were Hebrews. Or there may have been more than one church at Cesarea, (a thing altogether probable) ; and the Jews there, who were such uncommon zealots for the law, might have established a religious community of their own, separate from that of the Gentile Christians, whom the former would regard with an eye of jealousy, if not of distrust. If the author of our epistle designed it for the good of the Hebrews in *general*, he would have written just in the manner which he has adopted, whether the church whom he addressed contained some Gentiles or not.

Upon the whole, it is a plain case, that confident and positive assertions in regard to any one particular church, cannot be made with propriety. The most which I would say here is, that more reasons seem to offer themselves in favour of the supposition, that our epistle was originally sent to the church at Cesarea, than in favour of any other place. I cannot, therefore, but regard it as a *probable* event.

§ 12. *Antiquity and canonical authority of the epistle.*

Its *antiquity* may be established by evidence internal and external. The allusions made to the temple service, in the epistle itself, necessarily imply that this service was then performed, when the letter was written, Heb. 9:9, "Which [former tabernacle with its services] was a significant emblem in respect to the present time; *in which* gifts and sacrifices *are* offered, that cannot render tranquil the conscience of him, who performs this service." Again, in chap. 8: 4, 5, the writer says, "For if he [Jesus] had performed his service on earth, then he could not be a priest; seeing *there are* priests, who, according to the prescription of the law, *perform* their service in a tabernacle which is merely a copy of the heavenly one." Both of these passages clearly imply, that the temple rites were then performed, at the time when the writer composed our epistle.

Now as the whole temple service ceased, of course, with the destruction of Jerusalem, in A. D. 70, it is clear that our epistle must have been written before that period; and consequently it belongs to the apostolic age.

Another argument also in proof of this is, that the particular views which the epistle throughout gives of temptation to apostasy, are evidently grounded on the then existing rites of the Jewish temple-worship. The state of feeling among the Jews at large, (which resulted from strong attachment to these rites, and the zeal with which their views of these things were maintained,) and their extreme jealousy of every thing which had a tendency to diminish the supposed importance of their ritual, together with the imposing splendour and magnificence of the Levitical ceremonies, as then practised, all concurred to tempt those Hebrews who had embraced Christianity, and renounced the common views of their countrymen, to relapse into their former views and habits. The shape in which this whole subject presents itself, in the epistle to the Hebrews, manifestly implies that the Levitical institutions were then in full vigour. Of course, the age in which this was the case, must have been the apostolic one.

It is equally plain, that our epistle was written in the *latter* part of the apostolic age. Those whom it addresses are represented as having been Christians long enough to be qualified, had they been properly attentive to their duty in learning the principles of Christianity, to become teachers of it, 5: 12. The *former* days, when they were first enlightened, are spoken of by the writer, 10: 32, in distinction from the time then current. They are addressed also as having witnessed the death of their first teachers, 13: 7; and their then present teachers are commended to their affectionate regard, 13: 17. All these circumstances imply that some time must have passed away since the gospel was first preached among them, and they had been converted to Christianity. In other words, the epistle must have been written in the latter part of the apostolic age. The specific year I shall not here endeavour to ascertain, as it will hereafter be a subject of inquiry.

With the internal marks of antiquity, exhibited by the epistle itself, corresponds the external testimony that can be gathered respecting it. Clement of Rome is the most important witness that can be adduced, in regard to the point before us. His epistle to the Corinthians, (commonly named his *first* epistle\*), is the most considerable, certainly the most important and best authenticated, relic of ecclesiastical antiquity, which belongs to the first century of the Christian era. According to the general voice of the ancients, the author of this epistle is the Clement whom

---

\* It is called *first*, because there is a *second*, which bears his name, and which has usually been printed in connexion with the first. The first was so greatly esteemed by the churches in the early ages, that it was read publicly to Christian assemblies, in like manner as the books of the New Testament. It is very often cited, with great encomiums, by nearly all the Christian fathers. It has been assailed, indeed, by a few critics, in modern times; and what relic of antiquity has not? It doubtless, like most ancient books, has suffered somewhat in regard to the purity of its text, by frequent transcription, and by negligence. But, on the whole, it is a venerable and a precious relic of the primitive age of Christianity; and it is very generally admitted to be such.—The *second* epistle is quoted by none of the early fathers; and it differs in style and method so much from the *first*, that there can scarcely be a doubt of its spuriousness. Vide Clem. Rom. edit. Wotton. p. ccvi.

Paul mentions as one of his fellow labourers, and as having his name written in the book of life, Philip. 4: 3. He was the *third* bishop of Rome, according to Irenaeus (*contra Haeres.* III. 3), Eusebius (*Hist. Ecc.* III. 13. 15. 21. 34. 38), and Jerome (*Viri Illus. v. Clemens*). In the name of the church at Rome, and as their bishop, he addressed an epistle to the church at Corinth. This epistle, as all agree, must have been written within the first century; probably about A. D. 96. Several critics of high reputation are disposed to assign to it a much earlier date. For example, Pearson, Pagi, Dodwell, Wake, and Le Clerc, date it at a period antecedent to the destruction of Jerusalem, i. e. before A. D. 70. If their opinion be correct, the testimony of Clement's epistle will be still stronger in proof of the antiquity and authority of our epistle to the Hebrews; for this testimony, in such a case, must have been given within some eight or ten years after our epistle was written, and during the apostolic age. But be this as it may, I am willing to assume the latest date, which can with any shew of probability be assigned to Clement's epistle, viz. A. D. 96; for this will be only about thirty years after the epistle to the Hebrews was most probably written.

It will be seen, in the sequel, that the testimony of Clement will serve to cast light upon the two points of enquiry, which constitute the object of the present section, viz. the antiquity and the authority of our epistle.

I shall first exhibit the evidence that Clement has quoted this epistle, and then subjoin some remarks on his testimony. I enter into the examination of this matter the more formally and fully, because of the important bearing, which the testimony of a writer so early and respectable as Clement must evidently have upon the authority of our epistle, and indirectly upon its origin; and also because the subject has been, (at least, so it seems to me), imperfectly treated, and passed over with a slight examination, by nearly all the critics whom I have had an opportunity to consult.

It is a singular circumstance, that no book of the New Testament should have been so frequently quoted by Clement, as the epistle to the Hebrews. That such is the fact, any one may

satisfy himself, who will take the pains to examine his quotations as referred to in Wotton's edition of this author, or the detail of them as exhibited by Lardner, *Credibil. of Gosp. Hist.* I. p. 49 seq.

The quotations made by Clement from the epistle to the Hebrews may be arranged under four different classes; viz,

## I.

Passages in which the exact words, or nearly so, of the epistle are quoted.

## HEBREWS.

## No. 1.

1: 3. "Ὁς ὢν ἀπαίγασμα τῆς δόξης . . . . . 4. Ἰσοσούτω κρείετιων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὕσῳ διαφορωώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα.

7. Λέγει· Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτῷ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα.

5. Τίμι γὰρ εἶπέ ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων· Τίός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε ;——

13. Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶρηκέ ποτε· Κἀθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου ;

## No. 2.

Heb. 6: 18. . . . . ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι θεόν. . . . .

## No. 3.

Heb. 11: 37. . . . . περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασι.

## CLEMENT.

## No. 1.

Cap. 36. "Ὁς ὢν ἀπαίγασμα τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτω μείζον ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων ὕσῳ διαφορωώτερον ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκε.

Γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως· Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτῷ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα.

Ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἰῶν αὐτοῦ, οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης· νίός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. . . . καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν. Κἀθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.

## No. 2.

Cap. 27. . . . οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀδύνατον παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, εἰ μὴ τὸ ψεύσασθαι.

## No. 3.

Cap. 17. οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοις καὶ μηλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν.

## HEBREWS.

No. 4.

Heb. 10: 37. "Ἐτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ὃ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ.

## CLEMENT.

No. 4.

Cap. 23. . . . . συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς· ὅτι ταχὺ ἤξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ.

## II.

Passages containing the same sentiment, with more or less contraction of the expression, or an exchange of the original word for a synonymous one.

No. 5.

Heb. 4: 12. . . . . καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας.

No. 5.

Cap. 21. . . . οὐδὲν λέληθεν αὐτὸν τῶν ἐννοιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν διαλογισμῶν ὧν ποιούμεθα.

(Again, near the end) . . . . ἐρευνητῆς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐννοιῶν καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων.

No. 6.

Heb. 11: 5. Πίστει Ἐνώχ μετετέθη, τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον.

No. 6.

Cap. 9. . . . Ἐνώχ, ὃς ἐν ὑπακοῇ δίκαιος εὐρέθεις μετετέθη, καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη αὐτοῦ θάνατος.

7. Πίσει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε.

. . . . Λῶε πιστὸς εὐρέθεις . . . .

8. Πίστει καλούμενος Ἀβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελεθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον, κ. τ. λ.

Cap. 10. Ἀβραὰμ . . . . πιστὸς εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκουον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος δὲ ὑπακοῆς ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, κ. τ. λ.

31. Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συναπόλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν, δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης.

Cap. 12. Διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθη Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη.



## III.

Passages which are a paraphrastic imitation of the epistle to the Hebrews; or in which the style or phraseology of this epistle is more or less exhibited.

## HEBREWS.

## No. 7.

Heb. 11: 36—39. "Ἐτεροὶ δὲ ἔμπαιγμοῦν καὶ μαστίγων πέτρων ἔλαβον, ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς. Ἐλιθάσθησαν, ἐπίσθησαν, ἐπειράσθησαν, ἐν φόβῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον . . . καὶ οὗτοι πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

## No. 8.

Heb. 12: 1, 2. . . . τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν μέγος μαρτύρων . . . δι' ὑπομεινῆς τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα· ἀφοροῦντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν, κ. τ. λ.

## No. 9.

Heb. 12: 5—11. (comp. Prov. 3: 11, 12.) . . . νιέ μου, μὴ ὀλιγοῖται παιδείας Κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτῷ ἐλεγχόμενος. Ὅν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος, παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται . . . Οἱ μὲν . . . κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς ἐπαίδεον [ἡμᾶς], ὁ δὲ [θεός] ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ.

## CLEMENT.

## No. 7.

Cap. 45. (Ἐγκύπτειτε εἰς τὰς γραμμάς τὰς ἀληθεῖς ῥήσεις πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου . . . οὐ γὰρ εὐρίσκειται δικαίους ἀποβεβλημένους, ἀπὸ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν.) Ἐδιώχθησαν δίκαιοι, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἀνόμων· ἔνεφρακίσθησαν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἀνοσίων· ἐλιθάσθησαν ὑπὸ παρονομοῦν· ἀπεκιάσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν μιαιῶν καὶ ἄδικον ζῆλον ἀνεληφότων. Ταῦτα πάσχοντες εὐκλαιῶς ἤνεγκαν.

## No. 8.

Cap. 19. Πολλῶν οὖν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων μετεληγόυτες παραδειγμάτων (Wotton, πράξιαιον) ἐπαναδράμωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδεδομένον ἡμῖν τῆς εἰρήνης σκόπον καὶ ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸν πατέρα, κ. τ. λ.

## No. 9.

Cap. 56. Ἀναλάβωμεν παιδείαν ἐφ' ἧ οὐδεὶς ὀφείλει ἀνακτεῖν . . . ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται . . . γὰρ ἀγαθὸς ὢν παιδεύει ὁ θεός εἰς τὸ νοουθετηθῆναι ἡμᾶς διὰ τῆς ὁσίας παιδείας αὐτοῦ.

## HEBREWS.

## No. 10.

Heb. 4: 14 seq. "Εχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν.... ἰησοῦν.... οὐ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθεῖσαι ταις ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν.... προσερχόμεθα... ἵνα..... χάριν εὐρωμεν εἰς εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν.

## CLEMENT.

## No. 10.

Cap. 36. .... Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν, τὸν προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν. Cap. 58..... διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προστάτου ἡμῶν ἰ. Ληριστοῦ....

## IV.

Passages similar to texts in the Old Testament, but which Clement probably quoted from the epistle to the Hebrews.

## No. 11.

Heb. 3: 2. Πιστὸν ἄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν, ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

5. Καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ὡς θεράπων.

## No. 11.

Cap 17. Μωϋσῆς πιστὸς ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ἐκλήθη.

Cap. 45. Ὁ μακάριος πιστὸς θεράπων ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ. Μωϋσῆς.

## No. 12.

Heb. 12: 6. "Ὁν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος, κ. τ. λ. Vide supra under No. 9.

## No. 12.

Cap. 56. .... ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος, κ. τ. λ. Vide supra, No. 9.

I shall now subjoin a few remarks on the preceding view.

No. 1. Some parts of the passage, here extracted from Clement, may be found in the Old Testament as well as in the epistle to the Hebrews; but other parts of it are appropriate only to the latter. This, as well as the application itself of the passages taken from the Old Testament, shows beyond any reasonable doubt, that Clement must have had the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews distinctly in his mind, when he wrote the passage which is presented in the comparison.

That Clement in his letter, has added more of the second psalm than is found in the epistle to the Hebrews, forms no argu-

ment that he quoted directly from the second psalm, rather than from Heb. 1. In his view, clearly, the whole of the second psalm applied to the Messiah. To the quotation made from it by the writer of our epistle, Clement adds two other verses, in order to amplify and confirm the view of the subject which he has introduced.

To this statement we may the more readily accede, since it is often the manner of Clement, in making his quotations of Scripture, to intermingle passages taken from different parts of the Bible, without any notice, or any sign of transition from the one to the other.\*

No. 2. That Clement does not introduce this passage with the *formula* of a quotation, is no proof that it is not one; for he *often* extracts passages both from the Old and the New Testament, *without using any formula of quotation*, or without any intimation that he is about to quote. The singularity of the expression itself, exhibited in No. 2, and the fact that it is peculiar to the epistle to the Hebrews, are the grounds on which I should rest the probability, that Clement had in his mind distinctly the manner of expression in our epistle, when he wrote the sentence presented in the comparison.

No. 3. This is so plainly and exactly a quotation, of an expression *sui generis* in the epistle to the Hebrews, that to doubt whether it be in reality copied from this epistle, would be to doubt whether Clement has quoted in any case, except where he has given express notice of it. But a doubt of this nature can never be cherished by any one who has read Clement's epistle, and examined the method of his quotations.

No. 4 appears to me a case of quotation from Heb. 10: 37, which has the formula of appeal to the Scriptures prefixed, *συνεπιμαρτυρούσης τῆς γραφῆς*. The passage quoted is found,

---

\* E. g. Clement, (Epist. c. 50), after quoting from Is. 26: 20, adds another quotation (from what book it is uncertain) without any note of transition. So in cap. 53, after quoting Deut. 9: 12 seq., he goes on to quote other passages from different places, without any notice of transition. And so, frequently, in his epistle, where he arranges together various quotations.

in the sense in which it is used by Clement, in the epistle to the Hebrews. Another passage from which we might suppose the quotation to be taken, viz. Mal. 3: 1, is quoted at length, in immediate connexion with the one exhibited in the table, plainly because Clement deemed it to be a parallel one; so that we cannot choose the passage in Malachi, as the source of his quotation. There remains, then, besides Heb. 10: 37, only Hab. 2: 3, which affords any special resemblance to the quotation of Clement. But the passage in Habakkuk relates wholly to a *vision*, or *prophecy*, and not to a *person*, as in Heb. 10: 37; and to a *person*, Clement evidently applies it. The probability is then altogether in favour of the supposition, that the passage is quoted from the epistle to the Hebrews.

No. 5 is so alike in Clement and in our epistle, I can hardly persuade myself that the expression in the latter was not in Clement's mind, when he wrote the passages here extracted from him. Still, it does not appear to be a case, I readily concede, on which a conclusion respecting actual quotation or imitation can be built with entire certainty.

No. 6, although it does not exhibit an exact use of the *language* in our epistle, contains, in my view, one of the most convincing proofs of quotation. The arrangement of these examples together, as in the epistle to the Hebrews; the manner of characterising their actions or their rewards, viz. that they flowed from *faith*; and the almost exact similarity of ideas, in cases where these are peculiar to the writer of our epistle, all combine to prove (I had almost said) the certainty that Clement had Heb. xi. before his eyes, or at least before the eye of his mind. In what other part of Scripture, are these examples so arranged together? And where else is found such a method of presenting them to our view? In fact, imitation thus exact, of a passage so peculiar in its style and manner, is better proof that the passage was before the eye of Clement, or at least in his mind, than exact coincidence of language in some cases would be. In a short passage, such coincidence might be accidental, arising merely from similarity of views or of idiom. But *accidental* coincidence as to the mode of

reasoning and representation here, seems to be fairly out of the question.

No. 7 seems to be a kind of parody, upon the corresponding passage in the epistle to the Hebrews, or paraphrastic imitation of it. The extraneous matter which Clement inserts, has evident reference to the preceding context in his own epistle.

No 8. In Clement's epistle, the passage is in the sequel of the sentence, extracted in No. 3. Now as the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has exhibited the same order of thought, Heb. 11: 37 and 12: 1, 2, is it not probable that Clement had the corresponding passages of that epistle in his mind, when he wrote the one presented by the comparison? The similarity of costume in the two passages, can hardly fail to strike the attentive reader.

No. 9 may be somewhat doubtful, because it may have arisen from the passage in Prov. 3: 11. The whole strain of reasoning upon it, however, inclines me to believe, that Clement had in his mind the corresponding passage in the epistle to the Hebrews.

No. 10 exhibits an appellation of the Saviour, (*ἀρχιερέα*) which is peculiar to our epistle. There is, moreover, an evident similarity between Christ as *δυνάμενον συμπάθησαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν*, Hebrews 4: 15, and Clement's *προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν*.

Nos. 11 and 12 cannot, of course, be much relied on in the present case; as no decisive reason can be offered, to prove that Clement *must* have quoted from our epistle. From the tenor of the passages, and the context, I am inclined to believe that he did; but I cannot attach much weight to this supposition.

In order now to make a fair estimate of the comparison which has been made, and the weight of evidence to be adduced from it, it is necessary that we should have correct views of the manner of Clement's quotations in general, and the principles on which they are grounded.

I have examined the whole of this writer's quotations, both from the Old and New Testament, with a view to ascertain, whether any thing can be determined as to the *authority* which he attaches to them, from the *manner* in which they are made;

and also to ascertain, by a view of the whole, what his particular manner of quotation is. The result of this examination I will now briefly state.

(1.) Clement names no book of either Testament. He appeals, indeed, to the words of the prophets; but their names he evidently uses to indicate their *persons*, and not (as we do) the titles of their books. The importance of this fact, considered in connexion with the same usage by the writers of the New Testament, in respect to a critical examination of the genuineness of the titles prefixed to the books of Scripture, has been already adverted to in the preceding part of this introduction, § 10. p. 41.

(2.) Clement habitually appeals to the books of either Testament, with or without a formula which gives notice of a citation. He often prefixes *γράφεται, λέγει, εἶπεν ὁ θεός, γήσιν ὁ λόγος ἁγιος*, and the like formulas, to his quotations. But nearly as often, particularly in the New Testament, he cites without any notice or formula at all; evidently taking it for granted that his readers will at once recognise the quotation, without any pains on his part to designate it.

(3.) I find no satisfactory evidence of quotation from the Apocrypha, or any apocryphal writer now known. The instances of quotation from the Wisdom of Solomon (chap. xii. xxvii), alleged by Wotton, are plainly too far fetched to appear probable; and the reference to the book of Judith, (c. 55 of Clement), is only a reference to the story concerning her, which Clement evidently believed. There are, it is true, a few cases of apparent quotation, either from books not found in our present Scriptures, or from traditionary accounts; just as there are some quotations of this nature in the New Testament, which are not found in the Hebrew Scriptures. But there is no satisfactory evidence, that Clement received any of the known apocryphal writings, either of the Old Testament or the New, as canonical.

With these facts in view, I cannot well account for it, that Eichhorn, in his introduction to our epistle, should say, when speaking of the weight of Clement's testimony in respect to the canonical authority of it; "Clement indeed acknowledged the

existence of the epistle, because he has borrowed whole passages from it. But still, he no where cites it *formally*; as is the case, when he makes use of the other canonical writings of the New Testament. How much then can be educed from him, in respect to the credit to be attached to this epistle? Would he not have *formally* cited it, and named Paul as the author of it, if he had regarded it as canonical, and as coming from Paul?" (Einl. § 271.)

From this he concludes, that we can merely prove the existence of it in Clement's day; but nothing in respect to the credit which he attached to it.

But, as we have already seen, Clement is just as far from *formally* citing the other books of Scripture, as he is from *formally* citing our epistle. Often as he has quoted Paul's epistles, he never once appeals to his name, except in connexion with the mention of the first epistle to the Corinthians, where he could not well avoid it. With this exception, he has not even once named a single book of the New Testament, copiously as he has every where drawn from it.

Allowing, then, that Clement has not *formally* cited the epistle to the Hebrews, it amounts to no proof that he has not used it as Scripture. But we are not obliged to allow so much. In no. 1. above cited, from Heb. 1: 7, it appears that Clement has pre-faced his quotation with *γράφονται γὰρ οὕτως*; which is one of the highest appeals that he makes to the volume of inspiration. This very passage, too, is produced by Eichhorn as an example of Clement's quoting from our epistle; but the *γράφονται γὰρ* is wholly overlooked.

There is another instance also in Clement (c. 23), where the quotation from Heb. 10: 37 is quite probable, and which is pre-faced by *συνεπιμαρτυρούσης τῆς γραφῆς*; supra no. 4. If no. 7 be regarded, also, as a paraphrastic imitation by Clement of the corresponding passage in the epistle to the Hebrews, then is this a third direct appeal to the divine authority of our epistle; for he introduces the passage by saying, "Search in the Scriptures the true sayings of the Holy Spirit."

Thus much for the allegation of Eichhorn, that Clement has

no where cited our epistle *formally*, as he does the canonical Scriptures. But further. The conclusion which this writer draws from the *assumed* facts stated by him, is as erroneous as the facts themselves. One might indeed have expected, in a matter so weighty as that of Clement's testimony, and one in which the evidence is so accessible, that so manifest an error in regard to Clement's mode of quotation should not be committed. Nothing can be more evident to a critical reader of Clement, than that no conclusion can be drawn from the *mode* of his quotation, against the supposition that he believed the book quoted to be canonical. The fact, that he appeals to our epistle more frequently than to any other part of the New Testament; that he no where appeals, (so far as we can discover), to any apocryphal writings of either Testament; above all, that he appeals to our epistle by quoting passages from it in order to confirm and impress the truths which he is inculcating, and appeals to it in the same way and for the same purposes as he appeals to the most acknowledged parts of Scripture; the fact too, that Clement was the companion and fellow laborer of Paul, and was also bishop of the church at Rome, the metropolis of the world; that he wrote in the name of the church there to the church at Corinth,\* and that he addressed to them passages from the epistle to the Hebrews, in such a way as to imply that this epistle was already well known and familiar to them; these facts, taken all together, make on my own mind a strong impression, that the evidence is as clear and convincing, that in the age of Clement our epistle was considered a part of the sacred writings of the Scripture, as it is that any other book of the New Testament was considered as a part of them.

Such was the impression which in ancient times Eusebius had, from reading Clement's epistle. Speaking of monuments preserving apostolic doctrines, he says, [*Ἐπιστολῇ*] καὶ τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν τῇ ἀνωμολογουμένῃ παρὰ πάντων, ἣν ἐκ προσώπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τῇ Κορινθίων διειρηνώσατο· ἐν ἣ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους πολλὰ νοήματα παραθεῖς, ἥδη δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξεί ῥητοῖς τισὶν ἐξ αὐ-

\* c. 1. Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κ. τ. λ. is the commencement of Clement's epistle.



τῆς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νεὸν ἐπάργει τὸ σύγγραμμα ὅθεν εἰκότως ἔδοξεν, αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκαιαλεχθῆναι γράμμασι τοῦ ἀποστόλου, that is, “ [We count also the epistle] of Clement, acknowledged by all, which he wrote in behalf of the church at Rome to the church at Corinth; in which, exhibiting many of the sentiments of the epistle to the Hebrews, he makes use of some expressions taken from it in the very words of the epistle, by which he most clearly shews that this epistle is no recent composition; whence it seems likely, that it is to be reckoned among the other writings of the apostle [Paul].” Hist. Ecc. III. 38. I am not able to see how one who reads critically the epistle of Clement, can avoid the conviction that he has quoted it as Eusebius avers, and that he has appealed to it as Scripture.

Of other writers, belonging to the first half century after the apostolic age, we have but few remains; and most of these are imperfect. Some near resemblances to passages in our epistle to the Hebrews may be found in them; but after a careful examination of them, I have not thought them sufficiently definite and important to become the subject of discussion here; I shall merely subjoin them and leave them to the consideration of the reader.

The following are the passages usually compared.

Heb. 3: 5. *Μοῦσῆς μὲν πισ-  
τὸς ἐν ὄλῳ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ὡς  
θεράπων . . . . . 6. Χριστὸς δὲ  
ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, οὗ  
οἴκος ἔσμεν ἡμεῖς.*

Heb. 10: 25. *Μὴ ἐγκαταλεί-  
ποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυ-  
τῶν καθὼς ἔθος τισίν.*

Heb. 12: 17. . . . *μετανοίας  
γὰρ τόπον οὐκ εὔρε.*

Heb. 4: 12. . . . *κροτικὸς ἐν-  
θυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας  
. . . οὐκ ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανῆς ἐνώ-  
πιον αὐτοῦ.*

Barnabas, Epist. c. 14. *Μοῦ-  
σῆς, θεράπων οὖν, ἔλαβεν [viz.  
τὰς πλάκας.] Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος  
ἡμῶν ἔδωκεν, εἰς λαὸν κληρονο-  
μίας, κ. τ. λ.*

Barnabas, Epist. c. 4. Non  
separatim debetis seducere vos,  
tanquam justificati.

[Old Latin version; the original Greek  
here being lost.]

Hermas, Simil. VIII. 3. His  
igitur non est locus penitentiae.

Polycarp, Epist. c. 4. . . . *λέ-  
ληθεν αὐτὸν οὐδέεν, οὔτε λογισ-  
μῶν οὔτε ἐννοιῶν, οὔτε τι τῶν  
κροπιῶν τῆς καρδίας.*

Heb. 6: 20. Ἰησοῦς . . . ἀρχιερέως γενόμενος, comp. 7: 3, 24. 4: 14.

Heb. 13: 9. Διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ περιερέεσθε . . . ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες.

Heb. 10: 28, 29. Ἀθετήσας τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως χωρὶς οἰκτιρωῶν ἐπὶ θυοῖν ἢ τρισὶ μάργυρσι ἀποθνήσκει. Πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χειρόνος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας, ὃ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας, κ. τ. λ.

The passages may be found in Cotelerius; or in Lardner, Cred. I. pp. 43. 44. 131. 217. II. 830. I. 177. edit. 1734. See also Eich. Einleit. § 271, note 2. Several of them, (specially one from Polycarp naming Christ the *eternal high priest*), look very much like a *quotation*. But in a matter so weighty, it is not best to place very much dependence on them, as the similarity may be accidental.

Justin Martyr is the first considerable writer of the second century, whose works are come down to us. He was born about A. D. 103, and flourished about A. D. 140. In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, the following passage occurs. "This is he, who, after the order of Melchizedek, is king of Salem, and eternal priest of the most high," p. 341. He elsewhere calls Christ, αἰώνιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερεα, καὶ βασιλέα, καὶ Χριστὸν μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, p. 323. C. In another place, he says of Christ, καὶ ἄγγε-

Polycarp, Martyr. . . . διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; (quoted in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. p. 133. D.; so, also, in the Latin version of Polycarp, published by Usher). Add, from the same version, c. xii. . . . et ipse sempiternus pontifex, Dei filius, Christus Jesus. Lardner, II. 830.

Ignatius, Epist. ad Magnesios, c. 8. Αἰὴ πλάνασθε ταῖς εἰσεφοδοξίαις, μηδὲ μνθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνοχέλεσιν οὔσιν.

Ignatius, Epist. ad Ephes. c. 16. Λί δὲ οἱ τοὺς ἀνθρωπίνους οἶκος διασείροντες, θαιμίῳ καταδικάζονται πόσῳ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίαν νοθεύειν ἐπιχειροῦντες αἰωμίαν τίσουσιν δίκην, ὑπὲρ ἧς σταυρόν καὶ θάνατον ὑπέμεινεν ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, κ. τ. λ.

λος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος, Apolog. I. p. 95. D.; which name (ἀπόστολος) is given him only in the epistle to the Hebrews.

In addition to the facts already stated, respecting the early existence and credit of the epistle to the Hebrews, it should be noted, that the *Peshito* or old Syriac version of the New Testament, made, in all probability, during the second century; and the old Latin versions, made during the same period, and probably within the first half of it; both contain the epistle to the Hebrews, Bertholdt Einleit. p. 637 seq. 717 seq. This is a fact of very great importance; for these versions were in common use and authority, among the churches of the East and the West. It is not pretended that either of these versions, at this period, comprised any book which is now known to be apocryphal. Undoubtedly they did not comprise any, which were then deemed apocryphal. Here then is palpable evidence, that the epistle to the Hebrews was widely circulated among Christians, a short time after the apostolic age. In the west, the *Itala* and old Latin versions comprised it; in Greece, or the middle region, the church at Corinth are addressed by Clement as being familiar with it; and in the east, the Syrian church, wide spread as it was, comprised it in their canon.

From near the close of the second century onward, the history of the canonical credit of our epistle intermingles itself with the controverted question, *whether Paul was the author of it*. On this account, I shall not separately pursue the history any farther, at present, as it must necessarily be investigated, in the course of discussing that important question, which still remains for consideration.

The sum of what has been shewn, under our present head of discussion, is, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, probably but a short time before this event; that in about thirty years, at most, it had acquired such currency and credit, that the church at Rome, the metropolis of the world, in a letter addressed by their bishop to the church at Corinth, made repeated appeals to it as a book of divine authority, and in such a way as to imply a knowledge and acknowledgment of it, by the Corinthian church, similar to their own;

that Justin Martyr, about A. D. 140, has evidently appealed to its contents as sacred ; that about this time, or not long after, it was inserted among the canonical books of the New Testament, by the churches of the East and the West ; and that, consequently, it must have had, at a period very little after the apostolic age, a currency and a credit not at all, or at most very little, inferior to that of other acknowledged books of the New Testament. *Better* evidence than this of early and general reception by the churches, it would be difficult to find, in respect to a considerable number of books in the New Testament ; with *less* than this we are obliged to content ourselves, respecting several of them.

But admitting the early existence and general credit of this epistle, there still remains the most difficult of all the questions which have been raised respecting it. "Who was its author? Was it Paul, or some other person?" This very important question deserves, and must receive, a particular and thorough discussion.

### § 13. *Was Paul the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews?*

From whatever source the epistle to the Hebrews is derived, every reader of it must perceive, that it comes from a man of deep feeling, of a benevolent heart, of extensive knowledge, and of views, in respect to the *spiritual* nature of Christianity, as exalted as can be found any where in the New Testament. Every attentive reader of the Mosaic law, moreover, must feel, that the epistle to the Hebrews is the best key to unlock the treasures which are secreted there ; and that it affords us a disclosure in respect to the general nature and object of the Jewish dispensation, which Christians much need, and which can no where else be found in a manner so full and satisfactory.

But this, however correct or important it may be, cannot establish the fact that Paul wrote the epistle. We must not virtually assume this position from reasons *a priori*, or because we may wish it to be so. It is as uncritical to believe without any evidence, as it is to reject evidence when it is offered. It is uncritical also to establish, (or rather to attempt establishing), a

position that concerns a simple matter of *fact*, by any reasoning *a priori*. To investigate the present question in a becoming and candid manner, we must lay aside prejudice either in respect to the affirmative or negative of it; and also our previous opinions, which have been derived merely from education, and have not been established on the basis of proper evidence.

The epistle to the Hebrews has no *subscription*. Consequently, we are left either to conjecture who the author was, or to gather it from evidence external or internal. *Conjecture*, in respect to an epistle the claims of which are supposed to be *authoritative*, can give no real satisfaction to the thorough inquirer. *Circumstantial evidence* is that, then, to which we must necessarily resort, since the signature of the author is wanting.

I make these observations here, because it has seemed to me, that very much more has been demanded by some critics, in order to prove that Paul wrote this epistle, than the nature of the case admits, or even requires. Their demands would amount to nothing less than the signature of the writer himself, or direct testimony that he wrote it, given by witnesses then present.

In the investigation of the question, ‘Who was the author of an anonymous letter that is almost 1800 years old, written in an age and country where literary records (if they at all exist) are accidental and not designed?’ how can it be justly required, that proof of a direct, unequivocal, and positive nature should be produced? Where is the anonymous letter of antiquity, that could ever be assigned to any particular author, if demands such as these were made in respect to it?

The question is not, whether the point in dispute can be rendered *certain* by plain and indubitable testimony, (for then how should it ever have been disputed?) but, all things considered, whether there is not a *probability* in favour of supposing Paul to be the author of it—a probability deduced from evidence external and internal, which is sufficient to quiet our reasonable doubts, and to command our prevailing belief.

It is not modern critics only, who have been divided on this question. The ancient Christians early differed in opinion about it, for several centuries; the Latin or occidental Christians, after

the second century, generally rejecting it from their canon, as they did not reckon it to be Paul's; while the Greek, or rather the oriental, Christians generally received it as coming from the hand of the apostle Paul.

I shall divide the evidence, in respect to this question, into external and internal. By the former, I mean whatever can be gathered from the Christian fathers, or ancient writers, or the tradition of the churches, respecting the epistle: and by the latter, the characteristics of the epistle in respect to sentiment, style, and diction, compared with the acknowledged letters of Paul, and also certain facts which are adverted to in the epistle itself.

The great deficiency of genuine early Christian records, for many years after the completion of the New Testament, is a fact acknowledged, and lamented by all who study either the early history of the church, or that of its sacred books. A few fragments only we have, of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Papias, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and some others; in most instances too short, and too imperfectly preserved, to afford any strong ground of satisfaction to the critical inquirer.

#### § 14. *Testimony of the Alexandrine church.*

The evidence, that the epistle to the Hebrews was early recognized as one of the sacred books, has been already exhibited. The first testimony, that we have respecting Paul's being the author of the epistle, is that of Pantænus, the head of the celebrated Christian school at Alexandria in Egypt, who flourished about A. D. 180. This testimony was inserted by Clement of Alexandria, the disciple of Pantænus, and his successor in the famous school just mentioned, in a work of his entitled *Ἰποτυπώσεις*, *Institutions*, or *Sketches*. This work is now lost; but Eusebius has preserved an extract from it, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, Lib. VI. c. 14. Pantænus himself was the most learned Christian of the age in which he lived, and one whose weight and authority in the churches was very great.

Clement, in the extract preserved by Eusebius, is endeav-

ouring to assign a reason, why Paul had not subscribed his name to the epistle to the Hebrews. After giving his opinion in regard to this point he adds, "As our worthy presbyter, [so he usually calls Pantaenus], has already said, Since the Lord himself was sent by the Almighty as an apostle to the Hebrews, Paul being an apostle to the Gentiles, on account of modesty does not subscribe himself as the apostle to the Hebrews, both out of reverence for his Lord, and because being a preacher, and an apostle to the Gentiles, by a kind of supererogation he wrote to the Hebrews."\*

Two points are equally clear from this testimony; the first, that Pantaenus entertained no doubt of Paul's being the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, the whole passage implying as well as asserting this; the second, that still, either from the suggestions of his own mind, or from those made by others, objections had been raised against this opinion, because the epistle lacked the usual subscription or inscription of Paul. The attempt to solve these doubts, necessarily implies that they had been suggested from one of these sources; but from which, we cannot tell with any certainty.

I am very ready to allow, with some recent critics, that the attempt at solution is but a poor specimen of critical reasoning, and is insufficient to accomplish what Pantaenus designed to accomplish. For how was it necessary, as he seems to suppose, that Paul should have subscribed himself, *an apostle to the Hebrews*, if he had put his name to the epistle? If he declined doing this, "because his Lord and Master was the apostle of God to them," as Pantaenus says, still he might (as on other occasions he actually does) have called himself *an apostle of Jesus Christ*; or he might, as he twice does, have called himself *a servant of Jesus Christ*, Phil. 1: 1. Tit. 1: 1; or he might, as he twice does, have simply written his name *Paul*, 1 Thess. 1: 1. 2 Thess.

---

\* Ἡδη δὲ ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐπεὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀπόστολος ὢν τοῦ πατοκράτορος ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος ὡς ἂν εἰς τίς ἔσθι ἀπεσταλμένος οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον διὰ τε τῆς πρὸς τὸν κύριον τιμῆς, διὰ τε τὸ ἐκ περιστάσεως καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἑθῶν κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ ἀπόστολον. Lib. VI. 14.

1: 1. Why should he have been any more *diffident* with respect to doing this, in the present case, than in any other?

As to his *diffidence* arising from being an apostle to the Gentiles, which made him, as Pantaenus supposes, decline subscribing his name in an epistle to the Hebrews, so much weight cannot well be attributed to it. The writer of our epistle has told the persons addressed of his circumstances, and of his companions; he has also asked their prayers that "he might be speedily restored to them;" all which necessarily implies, that his name was not designed to be wholly concealed, and could not be so concealed, from those whom he *directly* and *originally* addressed: so that neither of Pantaenus' reasons for Paul's declining to subscribe his name, appears to have any considerable weight in it.

Eichhorn and Bertholdt, it must be acknowledged, have refuted the good father's *critical reasoning*, on which I have just animadverted; but they should not, (as they appear to have done), substitute this for a confutation of his *testimony* also. Bertholdt moreover maintains, that Pantaenus has simply expressed an *opinion*, that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews; an opinion *merely his own*, and not founded on any tradition. This he endeavours to prove by the following argument. 'It is clear that Pantaenus' expressions imply the existence of persons, in his time, who maintained the opinion, that Paul was not the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Now if general tradition maintained that he was, how could there be any such persons? For at this time, it was easy to trace a tradition of this nature up to its primary source.' Einleit. p. 2918.

But has there ever been a period, since the gospels or epistles were written, in which more or less of them were not discarded by some, and doubted by others? Have there not been some such men as Ebionites, Alogi, Marcionites, and others of similar character, in every age, and almost in every country? And can it be a valid objection to a book, or to testimony respecting it, that such men have rejected it, or doubted it? If so, then the whole New Testament must be given up at once, and the effort to maintain its genuineness abandoned as a task utterly



hopeless; for what part of it has not been discarded by some of these, or such like sectarians?

Does Pantaenus, I ask, tell us whence the doubts in question arose; whether from his own mind, from heretics, or from the members of the catholic church? Not a word of this. Be it then, that they came from whatever quarter you please, or from all quarters; the weight of his testimony is increased, rather than diminished, by the objections. For how does the case now stand? Pantaenus had objections to the apostolic origin of the epistle suggested, by members of the catholic church, by heretics, and by his own mind; yet such was the strength of his conviction, arising from the evidence opposed to these doubts, that he hesitates not in the least to consider it as an established point, that Paul was the author of this epistle. He speaks of it as being certainly his.

Now whence did Pantaenus derive such a conviction? Pantaenus, who was at the head of the first Christian school in the world; who resided near Palestine, and where constant communication was all the time kept up with that country; Pantaenus, who lived within a century after the apostolic age. It cannot be shown, nor in any way rendered probable, that he had any favourite or peculiar sentiment to be supported by the epistle to the Hebrews, which was the reason why he defended its apostolic origin. I am aware of the allegation made by some, that the epistle to the Hebrews was already received in the churches as one of the sacred books; and that, as some doubted respecting it because it wanted an apostle's name to sanction it, Pantaenus, in order to save its credit and defend the custom of the churches in receiving it as canonical, assigned the reasons produced above, why Paul did not subscribe his name to it. But is not this, after all, conceding the very point which it is meant to deny? "The epistle to the Hebrews was already received by the churches; therefore Pantaenus defends it!" Indeed? And how came it to be received? Whence this general credit already obtained? A credit so strong, a custom of reception so general, as to inspire Pantaenus with entire confidence in its canonical authority, and raise him above all the objections which had been

suggested. And how comes it, that no epistles should have made their way into the canon, amid all the conflicting opinions, and various apocryphal and supposititious writings, of the early ages of the church, but those which either bear an apostle's name, or were by *general consent* assigned to an apostle? This is a fundamental question, in respect to the great subject of the authority of our New Testament canon. It is an *articulus stantis vel cadentis auctoritatis*, in respect to it. And the answer to this question plainly is, that the catholic church in the primitive age, taken as a body, were governed by the maxim, that no book or epistle could be properly regarded as canonical, except such as was written by an apostle.

I am far from denying, that particular churches, and even particular regions of country, did, near the close of the second century, and afterwards, regard as sacred, some of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament and of the New. The quotations from them by the Christian fathers, is conclusive evidence of this. But then such books, for the time being, were of course estimated as holding a rank entitled to the credit of inspired books. And in respect to the *apocryphal* writings of the New Testament, it is clear that they were regarded, (where they were admitted as canonical), as either coming from the hands of apostles, or as having been written with their approbation, or under their inspection. Nothing can be more evident, than that there was a constant verging of the church as a body, toward the point of limitation, in respect to *canonical credit*, that has just been stated. That some churches and persons should have committed mistakes, respecting the extent to which the principle adverted to would carry them, is not at all to be wondered at, considering the state of literary knowledge at that period. But that such mistakes were not committed by the predominant part of the churches, is demonstrated from the state of the New Testament, ever since the earliest period; the received books of which are only those, which were regarded as being of apostolic origin, or revision, and *generally* believed to be so.

Such being the fact, we may ask, and we ought to ask, How came the epistle to the Hebrews into the canon; so that Cle-

ment of Rome in the very first century, and Pantaenus in the next, refer to it as Scripture? Why plainly, because an apostolic origin was attributed to it. Pantaenus regards this as certainty; and Pantaenus says, that the apostle who wrote it was Paul, *διὰ τε τὸ . . . τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν [Παῦλον]*.

I readily concede, that he is not a witness contemporary with Paul. But he is a witness, (and one of the very best the age afforded, in which he lived and was so distinguished as a man of knowledge), of what the opinion of the churches *then* was. Is it not evident, that in the passage under consideration, he is defending the *usual* opinion of the churches, in regard to our epistle; and that he is *not* merely delivering his own *private* sentiments? The manner in which he speaks, plainly declares this.

Moreover, that he did speak the opinion which was *prevalent* and *general* at this period, is rendered still more probable by the fact, that at least as early as the time in which he lived, probably earlier, the Syriac translation in the East, and the old Latin version in the West, as we have already seen, were completed; both of which went into general use in those countries, and both of which comprise the epistle to the Hebrews. In regard to the Syriac, it may be further noted, that while it was made too early, as it would seem, to comprise the 2d epistle of Peter, and the 2d and 3d epistles of John, (which for various reasons came later into circulation than the other epistles), it still comprises the epistle to the Hebrews. Are not these facts, then, when taken together, good evidence, that the credit of this epistle was early and widely diffused, and that it was regarded at a very early period, by the great body of the churches, as of apostolic origin? To which of the apostles it was assigned by current belief, and of course by current tradition, Pantaenus informs us.

Let it be distinctly noted, that all this took place within about a century after the apostolic age, (and probably less); "when tradition," as Bertholdt says, "might be easily traced back to its origin." Does not, then, the testimony of Pantaenus, whom Photius (Cod. 118) represents to be not only a hearer of those who had seen the apostles, but of some of the apostles themselves, supported as it is by concurrent testimony of the canon

of the churches in the East and in the West, amount to satisfactory evidence, in regard to general ecclesiastical tradition, at the time in which this father lived? And if so, does not this plead strongly for the probability, that Paul was the author of the epistle?

I am unable to distinguish the testimony in question of Pantæus, from that of other writers, whom Bertholdt quotes as good support for the genuineness of other books of the New Testament. How many hundred testimonies has he quoted, where the witness does not say whether he delivers his own opinion, or recites tradition! Yet Bertholdt takes these and such like testimonies, as legitimate evidence, when he sets out to establish the genuineness of any books of the New Testament, or of any ancient writing. Why then should he resort to the extraordinary, the unsupported, (I may say) improbable, supposition, that Pantæus has, in the case before us, only delivered his own *private* opinion? Even if it were so, the question, On what was the opinion grounded? What induced him to believe so? would present serious difficulties in respect to the suggestions which Bertholdt has made; as I have already shewn.

At any rate, the principle which Bertholdt assumes here, would render it utterly impossible ever to establish the genuineness of any of the New Testament books; and, I may add, of any other ancient book. A principle fraught with such consequences, cannot, either with propriety or safety, be admitted into our critical investigations.

The importance of this discussion, which treats of testimony so early and respectable, in regard to the subject in question, will, I hope, be a sufficient apology for the length to which it has been protracted.

Pantæus was succeeded, in his school, by the celebrated Clement of Alexandria, near the close of the second century. Clement, as he tells us in the first book of his *Stromata*, (p. 274. Lardner, *Cred.* II. 462), had travelled in Greece, Italy, the East, and Egypt, in quest of knowledge, and employed masters in all these countries. With Pantæus he settled down in Egypt; and he represents this teacher, though last in time, as

first in merit. He compares him to the Sicilian bee, that had gathered flowers from the prophetic and apostolic meadows; and represents him as filling the minds of his hearers with pure knowledge.

Clement, then, was well qualified to judge what was the general usage and tradition of the churches, in respect to the canon of Scripture; as he had traversed a great part of the regions where churches were planted. His testimony, (extracted from a work of his entitled *Υποτυπώσεις*), is preserved by Eusebius, in his *Ecc. Hist.* L. VI. c. 14. "In his book," says Eusebius, "Clement affirms that Paul is the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; and that, as it was addressed to Hebrews, it was originally written in their language, and afterwards translated by Luke for the use of the Greeks; which is the reason, why the colouring of the style is the same in this epistle and in the Acts of the apostles. The reason why Paul did not affix his name at the head of it, probably is, because the Hebrews had conceived a prejudice against him, and were suspicious of him. Very prudently, therefore, he did not place his name at the head of the epistle, so as to divert them from the perusal of it."\*

Eichhorn and Bertholdt have endeavoured to shew here, also, that Clement's testimony is only his own *private* opinion, or at most, that of his master Pantaenus. Eichhorn attacks the apology which Clement makes for Paul's omitting to prefix his name to the epistle; and seeming to triumph over this, he dismisses the whole of the testimony along with it. Bertholdt has pursued a course somewhat different. Pantaenus he represents as giving one reason why the name of Paul is omitted; Clement, another. This contradiction, he avers, proves that neither Pan-

---

\* Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ὑποτυπώσεσι . . . τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου μὲν εἶναι φησί· γεγράφθαι δὲ Ἑβραίοις Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ· Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμος μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδοῦναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Ὅθεν τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα εὐρίσκεισθαι κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ταύτης τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων. Μὴ προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ, Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, εἰκότως· Ἑβραίοις γὰρ φησὶν ἐπιστέλλον πρόληψιν εἰληφόσι κατ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποπιτεύουσιν αὐτὸν, συνετῶς πάνυ οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπίστρεψεν αὐτούς τὸ ὄνομα θεῖς. Lib. VI. 14.

taenus nor Clement rested on tradition as their support, but only followed their own conjecture.

This conclusion is somewhat singular. What is the point in question? Simply, whether Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews. Pantaenus says that he did; Clement asserts the same; both as it appears, without any doubt or hesitation in their own minds. How came they by this confidence? Clement derived it, says Bertholdt, from his master Pantaenus. But from whom did Pantaenus derive it? Whence did he get so much confidence respecting this point, as to overcome all the obstacles thrown in the way of such a belief? He appears to have been a man of great sobriety, knowledge, diligence, and excellence of character. He was no innovator; nor does it appear that he had any pride of speculative opinions and conceits to foster. But because he *answers the doubts*, that had been suggested against Paul's being the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, in *one* way, and Clement in *another*, "this," says Bertholdt, "is *contradiction*, and it shews that neither of these fathers grounded his opinion on tradition, but on his own conjectures." *Contradiction* in what? Are these two fathers agreed on the great point in question, viz. whether Paul was the author of the epistle? This is conceded. Where then is the contradiction? "They are not agreed how the doubts raised against it should be solved." What follows? "Why," as Bertholdt avers, "that they grounded not their opinions on tradition." That is, (if this have any appropriate meaning), that tradition had not brought down to them *the mode of solving these doubts*; since they were not agreed in the *mode* of solving them. But what if tradition had, as is most probable, handed down to them neither doubts nor solutions; and that the solutions they proposed were of *newly raised* doubts, which about this time began to appear in some of the occidental churches—solutions drawn, as I would most freely concede, from their own personal views, rather than from tradition; what, I ask, has the *manner* of solving these doubts to do, with the main point at issue? Nothing at all; and be it, that Eichhorn has triumphed over both the good fathers, Pantaenus and Clement, in shewing the incompetency of their reasoning to solve the doubts then

raised, it leaves their testimony, as to the great point at issue, quite untouched.

I am not disposed, however, to concede so much to Eichhorn's reasoning, in respect to the assertions of Clement. If Paul did write the epistle to the Hebrews, and direct it to a church in Palestine, every one acquainted with his history knows, that the Hebrews in that country, at least very many of them, were affected towards him as Clement has represented them to be ; and this might be a proper and adequate reason, for not setting down his name at the head of his epistle.

“ But Paul,” says Eichhorn, “ has not shrunk from openly professing his name on all other occasions.” This may be true. But to what other part of the church did he write, circumstanced as the Jews of Palestine were ? Does not a prudent man change the *mode* of his address, as circumstances may require ?

“ But after all, the author has not concealed himself. At the close of the epistle, he has developed circumstances which must certainly make him known.” I grant it, in respect to the church whom he immediately and primitively addressed ; but the case would not be the same in respect to other churches, for whom, also, there can be but little doubt, the epistle was ultimately designed. At least, those who read it, would first have been subjected to the influence of its reasoning, and its eloquent and powerful remonstrances, before they would come to make the inquiries about the author, suggested by the circumstances at the close. May not the author, who could write such an epistle, well have trusted to its power in disarming prejudices, which the appearance merely of a name at the outset might have heightened ? And might not Clement, who travelled through the East, and over so many countries, have thus become acquainted with the manner in which the difficulty was commonly solved, which he proposes ? This solution, although Eichhorn thinks it to be so incompetent, is still a much more probable one than that of Pantæus ; nay, I must think that it is in itself by no means destitute of probability. How can it be shewn in any way to be incongruous, that such a reason should have influenced Paul to withhold his name ?

But further; Bertholdt says, "Another proof that Clement did not ground his testimony on tradition, is, that he declares the epistle to have been originally written in Hebrew; and that Luke translated it into the Greek language; and thus he merely undertakes, in his own way, to account for the diversity of the style from that of Paul, and its similarity to that of the Acts of the apostles."

Be it so then, for the sake of argument. But still, what is the amount of this? Nothing more than that Clement undertakes to meet an objection, raised from the *style* of the epistle; and to show how this style could be somewhat diverse from Paul's, and yet the epistle derive its origin from that apostle. How can this determine, that Clement did not ground his belief of Paul's being the author of the epistle, on the tradition of the church, rather than on his own conjecture?

In fact, that Clement should have remained entirely unmoved in his opinion, by all objections made to Paul's being the author of our epistle, proves just the reverse of what Bertholdt has endeavoured to establish. It proves, beyond all reasonable controversy, the *strength* and *constancy* of his opinion, which triumphed over all such obstacles; and which to do this, must, as it seems to me, have been supported, in his own mind, by the general voice of the churches among whom he had travelled.

But further to invalidate the testimony of Pantaenus and Clement, Bertholdt suggests, that "they were inclined to favour the epistle to the Hebrews, on account of the Alexandrine spirit which reigns in it," [he means the spirit of allegorizing and finding secondary senses to language]; and "to establish the credit of a favourite letter, they attributed it to Paul, being supported in this by the apparent similarity which it has to his writings."

Now since this is altogether *gratuitous conjecture*, it might not improperly be answered, by *conjecture* that such was not the case. I will suggest, however, that it is by no means certain, either that Pantaenus or Clement were natives of Alexandria. The probability is, that they came there partly as learners, but principally as teachers; and that their opinions were not formed, merely by the fashion of interpreting the Scriptures at Alexandria. Besides,



what ground is there to suppose that these fathers, conscientious and deeply imbued with reverence for the Scriptures as they were, would have been persuaded by attachment to the Alexandrine spirit of allegory, to foist a book into the canon of the New Testament as Paul's, when they had no evidence on which to ground such an opinion? And how comes it, that at this very period, this same epistle was inserted in the canon, in the *Itala* of the western churches, and the *Peshito* or old Syriac version of the eastern ones? Did Pantaenus and Clement effect this? They had no concern with the management of either of these churches. Christians then in the East and West, far distant from Alexandria, did ascribe canonical authority to this epistle; and if they did so, there is of course good reason to believe, that they ascribed the epistle to an apostle as the author. What probability can there be, then, that Clement and Pantaenus ascribed this epistle to Paul, merely on the ground of their own *private* opinion or local prejudices?

The sum of testimony for the second century has now been presented. Its importance is greatly magnified, by its proximity to the time when the epistle was written, and when tradition respecting it might be traced back, as Bertholdt avers, without much difficulty, by a sober and interested inquirer. That at the close of the first century, the epistle to the Hebrews was not only extant, but in full credit as a canonical writing at Rome, we have seen in the examination of the testimony of Clement of Rome. That at the close of the second century, it occupied a place in the canon of the eastern, the western, and the intermediate churches, follows from the testimony that has now been examined. That Paul was the author of this epistle, appears to have been the firm belief of the most celebrated theological school then existing; and that this belief harmonized with that of the churches in general, who required evidence of apostolic origin or approbation, in order to entitle an epistle to a place in the canon, seems quite probable, and is contradicted by no circumstances with which we are acquainted.

We may now advance to the former part of the third century, and examine a few of the principal witnesses.

The celebrated Origen, second to none of the fathers (except Jerome) as a critic, and in general learning superior to them all, the disciple and the successor of Clement at Alexandria, is, in all respects, a most important witness to be examined. He spent his life in the study and explanation of the Scriptures; and his testimony in regard to the canon of Scripture, at the time when he flourished (A. D. 220), is of greater weight than that of any other individual of the same period.

The most explicit testimony of Origen is that which Eusebius has preserved, *Ecc. Hist. VI. 25*; being an extract from one of Origen's homilies on the epistle to the Hebrews. The passage runs thus in Eusebius; "In respect to the epistle to the Hebrews, Origen decides thus in his homilies upon it. 'The character of the style of the epistle to the Hebrews has not the unpolished cast of the apostle's language, who professes himself to be a man unlearned in speech, i. e. in phraseology. Besides, this epistle, in the texture of its style, is more conformed to Greek idiom; as every one must confess, who is able to distinguish differences in style. Moreover the ideas in this epistle are admirable, and not inferior to those which are confessedly apostolic; and this every one must concede is true, who has attentively read the writings of the apostles.' A little further on he adds, 'If I were to give my opinion, I should say, the phraseology and the texture belong to some one relating the Apostle's sentiments, and as it were commenting on the words of his master. *If any church therefore hold this to be an epistle of Paul, let it receive commendation on account of this; FOR IT IS NOT WITHOUT REASON (οὐ εἰκῆ)*, THAT THE ANCIENTS HAVE HANDED IT DOWN (παραδεδώκασι, *have had a tradition*) AS BEING OF PAUL. Who wrote the epistle, [*γράφας*, penned it, or, committed it to writing], God [only] knows with certainty; but the report which has reached us is, that some affirm it to be written by Clement, bishop of Rome; and some, by Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.' " \* *Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VI. 25. Lard. IV. p. 235.*

\* . . . . . περί τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει· ὅτι ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπισ-

This passage has been appealed to for different purposes, by writers of different sentiments; by some, in order to shew that Origen doubted, by others, to shew that he did not doubt, about Paul's being the author of the epistle in question. Omitting an account of what others have said, let us endeavour to elicit the sentiments of Origen, by considering this passage, in connexion with other passages to be found in his writings.

(1.) It is plain, that Origen felt the force of the objection against the authorship of Paul, drawn from the style and manner of the epistle, in the same way as his preceptor Clement had before done; and to meet this objection, he suggests a reason *similar* to that which Clement had suggested. Clement says, that the epistle was first written in Hebrew, and then translated by Luke into Greek; and thus he endeavours to account for the supposed diversity of style between this epistle and those of Paul. But Origen does not appear to have at all supposed that it was written, at first, in Hebrew. He supposes it to have been for substance delivered, dictated, or spoken by the apostle, and penned down by some one who used his own diction, commenting as it were on the words of his master. In this way, the *sentiments* are regarded as apostolic and authoritative; while the *diction* is considered as arising from one not an apostle; and thus the full *credit* of the epistle is maintained, while the objection to

τολης οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει. Ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμιος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογήσαι ἂν. Πάλιν τε αὐτὸ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαιμάσια ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐ δευτέρα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων· καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφησαι εἶναι ἀληθές πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀγαπήσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ. Τοῖτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων· Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφανόμενος εἶπομι' ἂν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστὶν· ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις, ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὡσπερὶ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἰ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμεῖται καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο. Οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι. Τίς δὲ οὐ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθές θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία, ὑπὸ τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν· ὑπὸ τινων δὲ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράφας τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς Πράξεις. Ecc. Hist. VI. 25.

this credit, drawn from the diversity of style, is apparently removed.

(2.) It should be noted, that Origen does not say, whether the objections against the epistle to the Hebrews being the production of Paul, arose from his own mind, or from the allegations of others. Most probably from both sources. He appears to have had a full conviction, that there was a diversity of style in it; and to remove the difficulty about the credit of the epistle, which arose in his mind from this circumstance, he resorted to the supposition just mentioned. We can have no reasonable doubt, that at this time there were some, who alleged that this epistle did not come from the hand of Paul; as Pantaenus and Clement had, before this, made an effort to remove objections against it.

(3.) The very manner in which Origen attempts to remove objections, shews that he gave full credit to the *apostolic origin* of the epistle. ‘The *thoughts*,’ he avers, ‘are apostolic, and worthy of an apostle; but the *diction* is derived from another.’ And when he says, “*It is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down as belonging to Paul;*” and then adds, “but who wrote it, God only knows with certainty, some attributing it to Luke, and some to Clement;” nothing can be plainer, than that he means here to suggest, that he considers it to be uncertain, who *penned* it, i. e. *reduced it to writing*; for he had just asserted that the *thoughts* were *suggested* by the *apostle*, while the *diction* arose from him who reduced them to writing. To suppose (as has been supposed) that Origen means to assert, that God only knows from whom the *sentiments* of the epistle sprung, or who the author was, in this sense, is to suppose that Origen has directly contradicted himself, in the very same paragraph. Therefore,

(4.) When Origen says that some attribute it to Luke, and some to Clement; the probability clearly is, (from the connexion in which this stands), that he means to say, ‘Some attribute the penning or writing of it down, to the one or the other of these persons.’ If this be so, (and it appears to be very plain that it is), it only serves to shew, that Origen did not consider the tradition about Luke and Clement as well established; and especial-

ly so, as the traditionary reports were not agreed respecting the amanuensis or recorder of the epistle. It is *possible*, I acknowledge, that Origen means to say, that some attributed the real authorship to Luke or Clement; although I cannot think that this opinion has any *probable* support, in the passage of Origen now under consideration, if it be explained by any just rules of interpretation.

(5.) It is clear that Origen ascribes his own belief, and the belief of the churches of his time, that the epistle was Paul's, to ancient tradition. "If any church receive this epistle as Paul's, let it be commended for this; for it is not without reason, that the ancients (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι) have handed it down (παροδεδώκασιν) as Paul's." Here two things are asserted; first, that the tradition of its being Paul's is well grounded, in Origen's view, οὐκ ἐκτῆ παροδεδώκασιν; and secondly, that it is an *ancient* tradition, for οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες have so thought.

I cannot well account for it, that Eichhorn and Bertholdt have kept out of sight, this direct testimony of Origen to the tradition of the churches. Eichhorn has indeed quoted it (§ 271), but made no comment upon it; while Bertholdt has broken the paragraph into two parts, and quoted what precedes the clause in question, in one place (p. 2944), and that which follows it in another (p. 2956); while he has *wholly omitted* the clause under consideration. The opinion of Pantænus and Clement, that Paul wrote this epistle, had previously been ascribed by these critics, either to their own conjectures, or to the influence which the views of the church of Alexandria had over them, in respect to this subject. Origen also is represented by them, as struggling between his own convictions and the prejudices of the times, in respect to the point in question, and as falling at last upon the conjecture, that 'the *sentiments* are the apostle's, while the *diction* is another's,' in order to reconcile his own views, and the current prejudices of the Alexandrine church. These critics have been very careful to render *prominent* the expression of Origen, *who wrote it God [only] knows, report attributing it to Clement and to Luke*; and they have quoted this too, without adverting at all to the evident meaning of it, which is, 'who penned or wrote

it down is uncertain, report attributing it to different men ;' using the expression just as if Origen had simply said, '*who was the author of the epistle, God only knows.*' See Berth. Einl. § 648. Eichh. § 271. Besides this, Bertholdt represents Origen as asserting, that an *ancient* tradition, brought down even to his time, attributed the *authorship* of the epistle to Luke (p. 2955), or to Clement (p. 2958); but that Origen, believing neither of these ancient traditions, declared that 'God only knows who *composed* it.' One cannot help remarking, how leaning towards a favourite hypothesis will help to obscure one part of testimony, and make another to stand out in relief. That *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες* have not, as Origen asserts, *without reason declared the epistle to be Paul's*, this critic has passed over with profound silence. On the other hand, "it is an ancient tradition," he says, "propagated down to the time of Origen, that either Clement or Luke *composed* it." But Origen himself does not say this. His words are simply "Who wrote it [i. e. penned it down] God knows, *ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία*, but a report has come to us, that it was either Clement or Luke." Now where is the *ancient* tradition, brought even down to Origen's time, ascribing the *composition* of the epistle to two different men, neither of whom Origen believed to be the author? So far from this, Origen says not a word here of *ancient* tradition; nor even of tradition at all. He does not say that either *ἱστορία παλαιά*, or *παράδοσις παλαιά*, brings down this report; but simply *ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία*, i. e. *report has come to us*, or, *it is reported, there is a report, report says*, that either Luke or Clement wrote it. Now he might have used the same expression, I freely concede, if such report had been ancient; but he might use the same, too, in reference merely to the reports of his day; at which time, no doubt, various difficulties were raised, in some of the churches, respecting the Pauline origin of the epistle. Certainly, then, Bertholdt has no right to represent Origen in the manner he does, as averring that *ancient* tradition assigned the *authorship* of the epistle to Luke or to Clement.

Indeed, the language which Origen employs, in this case, would seem to be *designedly* different from that which he em-

plays, in the sentence wholly omitted by Bertholdt, which runs thus ; “ If any church holds this epistle to be Paul’s, it deserves commendation for this ; because οὐκ εἰκῆ̃ the ancients have handed it down to us, that it is Paul’s. Observe the expressions οἱ ἀρχαῖοι and παραδιδώκασι, words altogether appropriate to the designation of truly ancient tradition, and not to be mistaken ; while the report concerning Luke and Clement is announced simply by ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀθάσασι ἱστορία, leaving it wholly indeterminate whether this report is recent or ancient ; for ἀθάσασι surely does not of course designate the antiquity of the report. Why Bertholdt should thus magnify this part of Origen’s assertion, and wholly omit all notice of the other which cannot be misunderstood and is not liable to misconstruction, is best known to himself. But thus much may properly be said, If the testimony of the ancients (or moderns), is to be managed in this way, then we may assert, with equal truth, our inability to prove any thing, or our ability to prove *aliquid ex aliquo*.

That Origen was not in the doubtful state about the epistle, which the critics just named represent him to be, may be clearly evinced from other passages in his writings, even if the one already examined were to be regarded as dubious. For example ; Comm. on John (II. p. 18. ed. Huet), “ According to this the apostle says,”\* and then quotes Heb. 5: 12. That by this apostle he meant Paul, other passages in the same commentary clearly show. E. g. “ In the epistle to the Hebrews, the same Paul says,”† p. 56 ; again, “ Paul in the epistle to the Hebrews,”‡ p. 162. In his book against Celsus, he says ; “ For it is written by Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians . . . and the same apostle says ;”§ and then he quotes Heb. 5: 12. Contra Cels. p. 482. ed. Bened. In his treatise on prayer, he quotes the epistle to the

\* Κατὰ τοῦτο φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ὅτι κ. τ. λ. loc. cit.

† Καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους, ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος φησὶ κ. τ. λ. loc. cit.

‡ Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους κ. τ. λ. loc. cit.

§ Γέγραπται γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ ἡμῶν Κορινθίοις ἐπιστέλλοντι . . . ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς . . . φησὶ, καὶ γέγονατε χρεῖαν ἔχοντες, κ. τ. λ. loc. cit.

Hebrews, as an epistle of the same apostle who wrote the epistle to the Ephesians, De Oratione I. p. 250. ed. Bened. In a homily, preserved in a Latin translation, he says, "Paul himself, the greatest of the apostles, writing to the Hebrews says;"\* Then he quotes Heb. 12: 18, 22, 23. He also appeals to this epistle as *authoritative*, in establishing any position; e. g. Comm. in John II. 57, 58. ed. Huet.

These testimonies can leave no doubt what the opinion of Origen was, as to the real *authorship* of the epistle, however he might account for what he deemed the peculiar colouring of the style. It is surely quite a subordinate question, Who was the amanuensis or translator of Paul. The important questions are, Did the *sentiments* originate from him? And is he the real author of them? If Origen has not developed his opinion respecting these questions, beyond all doubt, I know not that it is in the power of language to do this. If he has not most explicitly averred, that the *then ancient* tradition taught this, and for good reasons, I am unable to conceive how he could have averred it.

(6.) Let us ask, how far back must this testimony have gone, in order to be *ancient* in Origen's time? Nothing can be weaker, than the assertion that Origen refers, in his ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες, to Clement and Pantaenus; both of whom, were his contemporaries, and lived until he was about thirty years of age. Pantaenus died about 211, as Jerome affirms; Clement, about A. D. 217 or 220; and Origen was born A. D. 184 or 185. Now as Origen lived but little more than a century from the apostolic age, nothing can be plainer, than that the οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες must mean, either those who were conversant with the apostles, or at least the generation succeeding them. This not only confirms what I have already endeavoured to prove, from Clement of Rome, from the testimony of the Italic and Syriac versions, and from Pantaenus and Clement, viz. that the epistle to the Hebrews was *canonical* in the *primitive* age of the church; but it shows, beyond reasonable doubt, that Pantaenus and Clement be-

---

\* Ipse ergo apostolorum maximus . . . Paulus . . . dicit, ad Hebraeos scribens, etc. Homil. III. in Num. p. 231. edit. Benedict.



lieved Paul to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, in common with the churches of their times, on the ground of ecclesiastical tradition, and not from their own conceit, or their own prejudices in favour of Alexandrine notions.

(7.) It appears that Origen was strongly impressed with the conviction, that the style of the epistle to the Hebrews was different from the usual one of Paul. Yet so firm was his conviction, that the epistle for substance did originate from Paul, that he has not only often ascribed it directly to him, *obiter*, but given us at large his view, viz. that he considered Paul as the author of the *thoughts* or *ideas*. At the same time, he endeavours to account for it, without prejudice to this opinion or to church tradition, that the costume of the epistle is not Pauline, by supposing a disciple of Paul to have recorded the conceptions of his master in his own language. That Origen should have adhered to what he declares to be the tradition of the *ancients*, respecting the author of this epistle, under such circumstances, and beset with such doubts, exhibits in a most striking manner the strength of his convictions, and the weight of tradition in its favour.

The allegation made by Eichhorn and Bertholdt, that Origen conceded the epistle to the Hebrews to be Paul's, from forbearance to the prejudices of the church at Alexandria, and out of love to the allegory which is in it, the credit of which he would wish to defend, has no real support. In regard to his prejudices in favour of the church at Alexandria, we cannot suppose them to have been very strong; for he was banished from this place, in the midst of his public labours, when he was about 48 years of age, and he spent the last 22 years of his life principally at Cesarea and in its neighbourhood, never returning again to Alexandria. Yet in works published long after he resided at Cesarea, he ascribes to Paul the epistle to the Hebrews. And in regard to the *allegory* of this epistle, if this were the principal reason for receiving it into the canon, then why did he not also receive the epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and many other pieces of a similar nature, in which the ancient church abounded? We may well be permitted to ask, indeed, why should we ascribe any other motive to Origen for receiving this epistle, than what

he declares to have been a sufficient and commendable one in the churches, viz, that *the ancients, NOT WITHOUT REASON, had handed it down as Paul's?*

The opinion of the church at Alexandria appears to have been uniformly the same, after the age of this great man. I shall very briefly notice it here, as testimony later than Origen's, from this quarter, can amount but to little more than proof, that the opinions of himself and his predecessors continued to be held without variation.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, received the epistle to the Hebrews as canonical, and as the work of Paul, about A. D. 247 ; as did Theognostus, probably a teacher in the famous Christian school at Alexandria, about 282. It was received as Paul's by Alexander, bishop in the same city, about 313 ; by the celebrated Athanasius, bishop of the same place, about 326 ; by Didymus, master of the catechetical school there, about 370 ; and by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, about 412.

It is unnecessary to proceed any farther on, than down to the time of Jerome and Augustine ; whose opinion in favour of this epistle being Paul's, is universally acknowledged ; and whose influence over the western churches occasioned the gradual, and finally the universal, reception of it, by all those churches in that quarter where it had been rejected.

### § 15. *Testimony of the Eastern Churches.*

From Egypt let us now repair to the eastern region, and see what the tradition of the churches was in that quarter.

We have already seen that Justin Martyr, a native of Samaria, quotes from our epistle about 140. After Justin, there were no considerable writers, in this part of the church, whose works are still extant, until the time of Eusebius. Methodius, however, bishop first of Olympus in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre, seems pretty plainly to ascribe this epistle to Paul, about 292, Lard. VII. 261. It was probably received as such by Pamphilus, presbyter at Cesarea, about 294 ; as it stands in the midst of Paul's epistles, in a manuscript copied from one of Pamphilus, id.VII.325.

But the most important testimony from this quarter, (next after that of Origen, who lived at a period so much earlier, and spent here the most important part of his life, viz. the last twenty two years of it), remains to be recited. I refer to the testimony of Eusebius of Cesarea, the well known historian of the church, who has taken so much pains to collect evidence from all quarters, respecting the canon of Scripture. I shall produce his testimony in a collected view, in order to facilitate the comparison of it; and then subjoin a few remarks.

Lib. III. c. 3. "Fourteen epistles are *clearly* and *certainly* Paul's; although it is proper to be known, that some have rejected that which is written to the Hebrews, alleging, with the church at Rome, that it is spoken against, as not belonging to Paul."\* A little after this, in the same book, c. 25, he reckons among the books of Scripture, which he calls *ὁμολογούμενοι*, (i. e. *not contradicted* or *gainsayed*, viz. by such authority as to create any doubts, or to any considerable extent in the church), the *epistles* of Paul; in which, beyond all question, he includes the epistle to the Hebrews; for he afterwards particularizes the epistle of James, of Jude, the 2 Pet. and 2d and 3d John, as those books which are *ἀντιλεγόμενοι*, i. e. *called in question, contradicted*.† In the same book, c. 38, after saying that Clement of Rome had made many extracts from the epistle to the Hebrews, he adds, "Wherefore, not without reason this epistle is reckoned among the writings of Paul. For when Paul had written to the Hebrews, in their vernacular language, some say that Luke made a translation of it, and some, that this Clement did, of whom we have

\* Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες· ὅτι γεμῖν τιτὲς ἠθετήκασιν τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους, πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας, ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὔσαι αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαιτες, οὐ δίκαιον ἄγνοεῖν. Hist. Ecc. III. 3.

† Μετὰ δὲ ταύτην [sc. τὴν τῶν Παύλων γραφῆν] τῆς Παύλου καταλεχθέν ἐπιστολῆς· αὗς ἐξῆς κ. τ. λ. . . . ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις. Τῶν δὲ ἀντιλεγομένων . . . ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου . . . καὶ Ἰουδα, ἕτε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολῆ, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου. Hist. Ecc. III. 25.

been speaking.”\* In Lib. VI. c. 20, he mentions, that “Caius in a dispute against Proclus, held at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, blames the temerity and audacity of his opponents in composing new writings, and mentions only thirteen epistles of Paul, not numbering that which is inscribed to the Hebrews. Moreover, even to the present time, this epistle is reckoned by some of the Romans, as not belonging to Paul.”†

In Eusebius, we meet with the first ecclesiastical writer, who has designedly made out a full and regular catalogue of the canon of the New Testament; and who made extensive investigation, in regard to the opinions of the church respecting this subject. From a view of his testimony, collected and compared together, it is clear:

(1.) That there were, in the East, some who doubted whether Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews; and that they appealed, in support of this opinion, to the church at Rome. It is clear, too, that in the time of Zephyrinus, (about 212), there were persons in the western church, and probably at Rome, who denied that this epistle was written by Paul; for Caius reckons only thirteen epistles of Paul, probably omitting that to the Hebrews. And that this denial continued down to the time of Eusebius, in the church at Rome, (his words are, *παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισιν*, *by some of the Romans*), is clearly signified by this historian.

(2.) His assertion of the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, is as unequivocal and strong as language can well make it. “Fourteen epistles of Paul,” (of course the epistle to the He-

\* Ἐν ἧ [sc. ἐπιστολῇ Κλημέντος] τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους πολλὰ νοήματα παραφαις, ἦδε δὲ καὶ ἀντολεξεί ἡγήτοις τισιν ἐξ αὐτῆς χρησάμενος, σαφίστατα περιήστησιν ὅτι μὴ γόν ἑπάρχει τὸ σίγγραμμα. “Ὅθεν εἰκότως ἔδοξεν αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκαταλεχθῆναι γράμμασι τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Ἑβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρῴου γλώττης ἐγγράφος ὁμιληκὸς τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Κλημέντα τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἐξηγεῖσθαι λέγουσι τὴν γραφὴν. Lib. III. 38.

† Ἦλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαῖον λογιωτάτου ἀνδρὸς διάλογος, ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατὰ Ζεφυρίνον, πρὸς Πρόκλον τῆς κατὰ Φιρίγας αἰρήσεως κλειμακοῦντα κεινημένος· ἐν ᾧ τῶν δι’ ἐναντίας τὴν περὶ τὸ συντάττειν καινὰς γραφὰς προπέτιάν τε καὶ τόλμαν ἐπιστομίζων, τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποστόλου δεζαιριῶν μόνων ἐπιστολῶν μιμωοῦει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναριθμοῦσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς. Ἐλεῖ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισιν, οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου τυχεῖν. Lib. VI. 20.

brews is included, there being but thirteen without it), "are CLEARLY and CERTAINLY Paul's, *πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς*. And again, he reckons this epistle among the books which are *ὁμολογούμενοι*, i. e. *generally recognised, admitted*. These declarations Eusebius makes, with a full view of the objections urged against this epistle by some. It is clear, then, that he did not consider those objections as respectable enough, or sufficiently extensive, or well grounded, to raise any serious doubts in his own mind about this matter, or to weigh at all against the current and general opinion of the church on this subject. Consequently, nothing can be more directly to the purpose, for demonstrating the strength and generality of the opinion in the church, at the time of Eusebius, that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, than this testimony. For as Eusebius has been careful, even when asserting that the epistle is clearly and certainly Paul's, to note that there are some who dissent from this opinion, and also to collect, in various instances, accounts of disagreement in respect to it, it may be regarded as quite certain, that he viewed opposition to it as neither well founded, nor extensive enough to raise any serious doubts, about the correctness of the common opinion of the churches.

(3.) It is pretty evident, that Eusebius had heard of the objections drawn from the style of the epistle, which Clement of Alexandria and Origen had before endeavoured to answer. Eusebius thinks, that Paul wrote it in Hebrew, and says that some attributed the translation of it to Luke, and some to Clement. His own opinion is, that the translation is to be ascribed to the latter.

It will be recollected, now, that Origen, residing at the same place (Cesarea), had, nearly a century before, mentioned the very same report or tradition. The passage in Eusebius shews therefore, the uniformity of the tradition; it serves also to shew, that when Origen adverts to it, he means to say (as I have above supposed him to say), that God only knows who *penned* or *wrote down* the epistle; not, *who was the author of the sentiments*, for these he directly attributes to Paul; just as Eusebius attributes the *authorship* to Paul, and the *diction* to Clement.

(4.) One thing more is evident, from the testimony of Eusebius. While he records, with fidelity, the fact that there were some in that quarter of the church who doubted the Pauline origin of this epistle, he tells us, at the same time, that *those who did deny it, alleged the example of the church at Rome, in order to justify themselves in so doing.* The necessary implication of course is, that they could not support themselves by any creditable example in the oriental churches. Would they have made an appeal for support, to a church abroad at so great a distance, if they could have found it at home, and in their own quarter? Most surely not; for at that period, the church of Rome was inferior in credit to a number of other churches in the east. The very nature of this appeal shews, that respectable support for the denial of the Pauline origin of our epistle, could not be found in the east.

Eichhorn has, indeed, cited the above testimony of Eusebius; but he has passed it without comment, excepting the single remark, that ‘the reason of Eusebius, for supposing Paul to have written the epistle to the Hebrews, was, that it was very old, and was cited so far back as the time of Clement of Rome;’ a reason which, if it were well founded, would of course make Paul the author of all very old ecclesiastical writings, which had been often cited, and were anonymous.

Bertholdt has exhibited more sensibility to the testimony of Eusebius. He confesses that Eusebius founds his judgment respecting the books of the New Testament, on the tradition of the oriental church. The repeated asseverations of Eusebius as to this point, did not permit him to conclude otherwise; although Eichhorn has left out of sight every circumstance of this nature. But then, says Bertholdt, “Did this tradition go back to the apostolic age? Undoubtedly not,” he answers; “it went back only to Pantaenus and Clement of Alexandria, who grounded it only upon supposition, or on their own personal views and feelings.” And then he goes on to assert, that ‘the epistle to the Hebrews was first favourably received at Alexandria, because it was so congenial to the allegorizing spirit of that place; thence the credit of it diffused itself to Antioch in Syria; and what An-

tioc and Alexandria believed concerning it, would in process of time be believed by all the other churches in Egypt, and in the East. Thus it came about, that in Eusebius' time there was such a general consent among the churches of his neighbourhood, in the belief that Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews.'

It is not *necessary* to answer this, except by saying, that from beginning to end, it is a series of *suppositions*, wholly unsupported by a single historical *fact*, and wholly incapable of being supported by any *known facts*. The examination through which we have already passed, has, I trust, afforded sufficient evidence, that the suppositions in question are *contrary to facts*, and destitute therefore of any actual support, as well as of any tolerable degree of probability. What connexion had Antioch with Alexandria? And how should a single Egyptian church and school, planted and instituted late in the apostolic age, if not after it, influence all the churches of the East, planted by Paul and the other apostles, and nurtured by their personal hearers and disciples, so as to make them receive a supposititious book into their canon? And why should not a multitude of other allegorical books, (like the Shepherd of Hermas), written in or near the apostolic age, have been advanced to a place in the canon by the Alexandrine church, and thence have diffused their credit among all the eastern churches? But it is unnecessary to proceed with such questions. If principles of argument, and methods of weighing testimony respecting ancient writings, may be adopted, like those which Eichhorn and Bertholdt have adopted here, in order to maintain the theory which they had espoused, any ancient writing whatever may be proved to be either spurious or genuine, as shall best suit the notion of any individual. He has only to make out a series of bold and confident *suppositions*, and his work is done.

I deem it unnecessary to detail the testimony of writers in the oriental churches, subsequent to the time of Eusebius. I shall merely advert to them, because it is not denied by any respectable critics, that, subsequent to this period, the epistle to the Hebrews was generally regarded in the East as Paul's.

Archelaus bishop of Mesopotamia received the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, about A. D. 300 ; as did the author of the Synopsis of Scripture ascribed to Athanasius, and written about 320 ; Adamantius, about 330 ; Cyril of Jerusalem, about 348 ; the council of Laodicea, about 363 ; Epiphanius, about 368 ; Basil, about 370 ; Gregory Nazianzen, about 370 ; Gregory Nyssen, about 371 ; Ephrem Syrus, about 370 ; Diadore of Tarsus, about 378 ; and Chrysostom, about 398. Others might be named, which are mentioned in Lardner's collection of testimonies, but it is superfluous. The object on account of which these have been adduced, is merely to shew the unity and universality of the opinion, in the oriental churches, that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, subsequently to the time of Eusebius, on whose testimony I have already dwelt.

In fact, not a single writer of any respectability in the catholic church, in all the east, has been produced, who rejected this epistle ; an extraordinary circumstance, indeed, if the belief of its apostolic origin was not altogether a predominant one in Egypt, and throughout all the eastern world. That there were individuals in this part of the church, who doubted or denied the authenticity of it, will certainly be admitted by every unprejudiced inquirer. But that there was any thing like a respectable or widely diffused party, who denied it, can be supported by no competent evidence whatever.

T

§ 16. *Testimony of the Western Churches.*

In the western churches the case was certainly different. We come now to take a view of their opinion.

We have already seen, that Clement of Rome, at the close of the apostolic age, has frequently quoted this epistle, and in the same way and for the same purposes, that he does other parts of the Scripture ; and consequently, we cannot entertain reasonable doubts, that he regarded it as a part of the sacred records. Eusebius long ago drew the same conclusion. "Clement," says he, "in his epistle acknowledged by all, which he wrote to the Corinthians in behalf of the church at Rome, exhibits many sen-



timents that are contained in the epistle to the Hebrews, making use of the very words of the epistle in several sentences, by which he shews most clearly, that this writing is not recent ; whence it seems probable, that it is to be reckoned among the other writings of the apostle," *Ecc. Hist.* III. 38. (See the original Greek, on p. 86, above). That it had such credit, in this quarter of the church, for some time after this, is sufficiently manifest from the fact, that the *old Latin version* comprises it ; which was probably made before A. D. 150, or (as almost all acknowledge) before A. D. 200.

The first *negative* evidence to be found among the western churches, respecting the question before us, is that of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in France, during the latter part of the 2d century. Neither the country from which he sprung, nor the time of his birth or death, are known with any certainty. Eichhorn has placed him at A. D. 150, evidently in order to throw his testimony as far back toward the apostolic age as possible. Lardner places him at A. D. 178, a much more probable era. He was a disciple of Polycarp, when very young ; for he states himself, that when a child, he was a hearer of Polycarp, in hither Asia, V. 20.

Photius (fl. A. D. 858) tells us in his *Bibliotheca*, that Stephen Gobar, a writer of the middle ages, says, that Irenaeus and Hippolytus, declare "the epistle to the Hebrews not to be Paul's," *Cod.* 152. *Eich.* p. 519. Whence Gobar drew his conclusion, Photius does not inform us ; nor does it any where appear. In all the writings of Irenaeus, now extant, no such assertion is contained ; but then several of his writings are lost. That Irenaeus was acquainted with the epistle to the Hebrews, and that he has cited it, is directly testified by Eusebius ; who says, that "he wrote a book of various disputations, in which he mentions the epistle to the Hebrews, and the book called the Wisdom of Solomon, quoting some expressions from them,"\*

---

\* Καὶ βιβλίον τι [sc. ἔγραψε Εἰρηναῖος] διαλίξων διαφόρων, ἐν ᾧ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ τῆς λεγομένης σοφίας Σολομῶντος, μνημονεύει ἕηται τινὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν παραθέμενος, π. τ. λ. *Hist. Ecc.* V. 26.

V. 26. But Eusebius does not say whether he quotes them as Scripture or not; and as the book of Irenaeus, to which he adverts, has perished, we have now no certain means of judging. Storr, Cramer, and some other critics, have called in question this assertion of Gobar, and have supposed that it is only a conclusion which he drew, from the fact that Irenaeus had not quoted the epistle to the Hebrews in his works. But this reasoning must, of course, be merely hypothetical. We have the bare assertion of Gobar, without the grounds; and as Irenaeus has made no use of the epistle to the Hebrews, in his works still extant, the probability seems to be, that Gobar has given a correct statement. The passages produced by Lardner, as possible quotations, have indeed a close affinity with some passages in the epistle to the Hebrews; but still they may have been taken from the Old Testament instead of this epistle. (Lard. I. 368—370.) Neither can the fact, that Irenaeus has quoted the epistle to the Hebrews, (which is sufficiently vouched for by Eusebius), determine the question in respect to the nature of his testimony; for surely he may have quoted books, which he did not regard as Scriptural. On the whole, in the present state of evidence, it would seem, that we ought to admit it as probable, that Irenaeus did not include the epistle to the Hebrews in his canon; but on what ground, is uncertain. It may, indeed, have been the case, that this epistle, originally addressed to Hebrews in Palestine, had not yet obtained circulation and credit among that part of the church in Asia Minor, where Irenaeus lived when he was a youth. It is not improbable, too, that he went in early life, with Polycarp his teacher, to Rome; and that he remained there until he was sent to Lyons in France, where he became the successor of Pothinus, in the bishopric of that city. In this way it may be accounted for, that Irenaeus came to cherish doubts respecting the epistle to the Hebrews; which, we shall see, began to be somewhat extensively cherished in the Roman churches, during the latter half of the second century.

At the same time, one cannot but remark, that it appears quite singular, when Eusebius expressly mentions Irenaeus as having quoted the epistle to the Hebrews, that he should not, on

this occasion or some other, have at all adverted to the fact of his having denied the Pauline origin of this epistle, if such were the fact. This is the more singular, because Eusebius has devoted a chapter of considerable length, in his work, entirely to giving an account of the manner in which Irenaeus had mentioned the sacred books; and in this chapter there is not a word of Irenaeus quoted, respecting the epistle to the Hebrews. *Ecc. Hist.* V. 8.

Moreover, Eusebius has evidently been careful and particular, on all occasions where the epistle to the Hebrews was treated of, to mention objections to it; or where persons of consideration in the church were named who rejected it, to state this fact. Eusebius also must have had the writings of Irenaeus, in a more perfect state and much more complete, than Gobar who lived so long afterwards. And as Irenaeus was a writer for whom Eusebius evidently cherished a high respect, it is really very difficult to account for it, that he should not have once adverted to the opinion, which Gobar affirms was held by Irenaeus.

Difficult, however, as this would seem to be, the supposition that Irenaeus did *not* acknowledge our epistle, is somewhat strengthened by the united asseveration of Gobar and Photius himself, (*Eichhorn* p. 519), that Hippolytus, (whom Photius calls a disciple of Irenaeus, and who probably flourished about A. D. 220), asserts of the epistle to the Hebrews, that it is not Paul's, *Eichh.* p. 520. This Hippolytus is called, by Eusebius, a bishop of some place; but neither he, nor Jerome, knew its name. The probable opinion is, that it was *Portus Romanus*. *Lard.* III. 89, seq. The assertion in question was made, as Photius states, in a book of Hippolytus against heresies, which he compiled from a work of Irenaeus. But as the work is lost, all that remains is the statement of Gobar and Photius; which seems, however, to be entitled to credit.

In accordance with this denial of the Pauline origin of our epistle, is the testimony of Eusebius in respect to Caius. Caius is called, by Photius, a presbyter of the church of Rome; which is quite probable, although Eusebius and Jerome simply state that he was a presbyter, without naming the place of his residence.

He flourished, it is most probable, about A. D. 210. The statement of Eusebius is as follows.

“There hath come to us a dialogue of Caius, a most eloquent man, held at Rome under Zephyrinus, with Proclus a patron of the Montanist heresy ; in which, reproving the rashness and audacity of his opponents in forging new writings, he makes mention of only thirteen epistles of the holy apostle, not numbering that to the Hebrews with the others ; and even to the present time, some of the Romans do not reckon it to be Paul’s.” Lard. III. 24. Eus. VI. 20. See the original, on p. 114. above.

The new writings or scriptures here mentioned, were the prophecies which the enthusiastic Montanists feigned to have delivered by inspiration ; Montanus having declared himself to be the Paraclete. See Euseb. V. 14. 18. Jerome states, that Caius denied the epistle to the Hebrews to be Paul’s ; *De Vir. illus. voc. Caius*. But Eusebius and Photius simply say, that he omitted it in his account of the canonical books ; which however virtually implies, under such circumstances, what Jerome declares.

In what circumstances this dialogue was composed ; whether it was first actually held, for substance, with Proclus, and afterwards written down ; or whether it was only written, (like the dialogues of Plato, Cicero, and others), in order to represent the sentiments of Proclus and confute them ; whether it was held publicly, with the approbation of Zephyrinus and his presbyters, or not, we are not informed, and have no certain means of discovering. But I think it must be regarded as probable, that Caius would not venture upon the publication of such a dialogue at Rome, without the concurrence or approbation of the church there.

Other evidence also is adduced, that doubts whether the epistle to the Hebrews was Paul’s had already begun at Rome, and in the west, toward the close of the second century. Muratorius, (*Antiqq. Ital. medii Aevi. Tom. III. p. 854*), has published a fragment of an anonymous author, who probably lived near the close of the second century, that contains a catalogue of books which he deemed canonical, and which lacks the epistle to the Hebrews, those of James, Peter, and 3d John ; while it con-

tains some apocryphal books. Speaking of Paul's epistles, this anonymous writer says, "Fertur [epistola] etiam ad Laodicenses. Alia apud Alexandrinos Paulli nomine ficta ad haeresin Marcionis, et alia plura; quae in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest, fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit." That is, "An epistle is in circulation addressed to the Laodiceans. Another is current with the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul, for the sake of promoting the heresy of Marcion, and many other things; which the catholic church cannot receive, for it is not proper to mingle gall with honey."

Critics have supposed, that by the *alia apud Alexandrinos*, this writer means the *epistle to the Hebrews*, which was received by the Greeks or Alexandrians. But surely it must be very doubtful, whether our epistle to the Hebrews is meant, as this anonymous writer admits several books not canonical into his catalogue, and excludes several others which are so. Besides, he mentions another fictitious epistle, viz. that to the Laodiceans. Why may not this *epistle among the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul, in favour of the Marcion heresy*, be wholly different from our epistle to the Hebrews; which has not, and never had, the name of Paul affixed to it? And then how could this writer say, *forged in favour of the Marcionite heresy?* a heresy which denied the divine origin of the Jewish religion, and rejected the God of the Old Testament; two fundamental articles on which our epistle to the Hebrews is built. Nothing could be more directly opposed to Marcion, than this epistle. The probability therefore is, that our epistle to the Hebrews is *not* designated by the anonymous writer in question. But if it really be the fact, that he did mean to designate it, his consummate ignorance of the nature of its contents, forbids us to attach any weight of importance to his testimony.

But more definite and satisfactory evidence, that, about the close of the second century, there were doubts among the western churches whether our epistle was of apostolic origin, may be adduced from the works of Tertullian. This father, who flourished about A. D. 200, says in his book *De Pudicitia* (c. 20), "There is an *epistle of Barnabas inscribed to the Hebrews*;

therefore by a man of such authority, that Paul placed him next to himself in respect to abstinence ; ‘ Am I and Barnabas only without power to do this?’ And, certainly, this epistle of Barnabas is more received among the churches, than the apocryphal *Pastor of adulterers*,” [he means the *Shepherd of Hermas*]. “ Warning therefore the disciples, that leaving the first principles, etc.” [quoting Heb. 6: 1. etc.]\*

That Tertullian also alludes to the epistle to the Hebrews, in other passages, seems to me quite probable, from the instances of this nature produced by Lardner, II. 608—612. But it no where appears, what credit he attached to this epistle. It is plain from the passage quoted, that he ascribed it to Barnabas ; and not improbable, that the churches in his neighbourhood, and perhaps at Rome, did the same, at this period. It is also plain, that he does not ascribe *full* canonical credit to it, because he does not consider it as the work of an apostle ; otherwise he would have vehemently urged its authority upon his opponents, as the passage which he quotes seems extremely apposite to his purpose, which was to prove that lapsed Christians could not again be received into the bosom of the church. That there was a division of opinion among the churches of his day, in the region where he lived, at least, seems to be plainly indicated, by his saying that this epistle was more correct, and of more authority in the churches, than the *Shepherd of Hermas* ; which latter, however, we know to have been early admitted as part of the sacred records, by a number of churches in the West.

On the whole, it is plain that Tertullian did not admit our epistle to be Paul’s ; and that there were churches in that region, who doubted or denied that it was his.

---

\* Volo, tamen, ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superinducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Exstat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, adeo satis auctoritatis viro, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenere ; ‘ Aut ego solus et Barnabus non habemus hoc operandi potestatem?’ Et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae, illo apocrypho pastore mochorum. Monens itaque discipulos, ‘ Omissis omnibus initiis,’ etc. *De Pudicitia*, c. 20.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, comes next as a witness for the negative of our question. He flourished about A. D. 248, i. e. the next generation after Tertullian, who died about A. D. 220. From Cyprian, however, no direct testimony can be adduced. It is agreed, that he no where quotes the epistle to the Hebrews in his works; which we cannot well account for, if he admitted its authority. There is but one passage hitherto produced from him, which seems to have a bearing on our question. It is as follows; "The apostle Paul who was mindful of this authorized and well known number, [he is speaking of the number seven], writes to seven churches."\* This would of course exclude the epistle to the Hebrews, as there are seven churches addressed besides this. But still, I cannot consider this testimony so decisive as Lardner and Eichhorn do, in respect to Cyprian's canon. For as the epistle to the Hebrews has no address, Cyprian may have had reference only to such of Paul's epistles as have an address to churches prefixed, which are seven in number. I do not therefore regard this passage as amounting to much. The fact that Cyprian has no where quoted the epistle to the Hebrews, considering how many writings he has left behind him, and how many occasions he had to quote the sentiments contained in it, renders it probable, either that he was unacquainted with the epistle, or that he did not admit its canonical authority.

Novatus, a presbyter of Rome (A. D. 251), the founder of the Novatian sect, is supposed by some critics not to have received the epistle to the Hebrews. This inference is drawn from the fact, that he does not appeal to it, in behalf of the sentiments which he maintained, respecting the exclusion of the lapsed heretics from readmission to the church. There are passages in his writings, however, in which he seems to refer to the epistle to the Hebrews. e. g. "It is asserted of Christ, by prophets and

---

\* Et apostolus Paulus, qui hujus numeri legitimi et certi meminit, ad septem ecclesias scribit. De Exhort. Mart. cap. XI.

apostles that he sitteth at the right hand of the Father ;”\* comp. Heb. 1: 3. Again, “Christ is found to be greater and better not than one angel only, but than all the angels.”† The last of these passages in particular, looks very much like a quotation from Heb. 1: 4. Be the case as it may respecting Novatus himself, his followers, about thirty years afterwards, admitted the epistle in question ; as is clear from the testimony of Philaster (about A. D. 380) on this subject, who states that they received the usual canon of the Old and New Testament. Philast. Hæres. 82.

This is all the negative testimony that I have been able to find, in the churches of the west, previously to A. D. 400 ; excepting what is implied in the statements of some of the Latin writers, to whom I shall now advert.

We have already seen, in the passage cited from Tertullian, an intimation of a difference of opinion among the western churches, in respect to the epistle to the Hebrews, as if some received and some rejected it. Lactantius, about 306, who does not often quote scripture, at least with any good degree of accuracy, seems to me to have some indubitable references to the epistle to the Hebrews, which Lardner has drawn out at length. (VII. 185—188.) ; but as they only seem to recognize the authority of the epistle, but do not ascribe it to Paul, I shall not adduce them here.

The epistle to the Hebrews was clearly received as Paul’s by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, about A. D. 354 ; by Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, about 354 ; by Victorinus, a famous rhetorician at Rome, about 360 ; by Ambrose, bishop of Milan, about 374 ; by Philaster, bishop of Brescia in Italy, about 380 ; who states, however, that there were some who did not admit it to be Paul’s ; by Gaudentius, his successor, about 387 ; by the celebrated Jerome, about 392 ; by Ruffinus, about 397 ; and by Augustine, about 400.

---

\* Aut cum sedere ad dextram Patris, et a prophetis et ab apostolis approbatur. De Reg. Fid. c. 26.

† Qui non uno, sed omnibus angelis et major et melior invenitur. Ibid. c. 20.



But the testimony of Augustine and Jerome, whose influence appears to have been effectual in reestablishing the credit of the epistle to the Hebrews among the western churches, deserves to be adduced here, as it serves to shew, that the Latin churches had not been united in respect to the point in question.

Jerome, in his epistle to Dardanus, has the following passage. "This is to be maintained, that this epistle, which is inscribed to the Hebrews, is not only received by the churches of the East as the apostle Paul's, but has been, in past times, by all ecclesiastical writers in the Greek language ; although most [Latins] think that Barnabas or Clement was the author. And it matters not whose it is, since it belongs to some ecclesiastical man, and is daily commended by the reading of it in the churches. But if the custom of the Latins does not receive it among the canonical writings, etc.)\* Again ; "Among the Romans, it is not received down to the present time as an epistle of Paul."† This general assertion means only that 'such is, or has been, the predominant custom among the Romans ;' as is plain, from a passage in his epistle to Evagrius, where he says, "which epistle to the Hebrews all the Greeks receive, and *some* of the Latins."‡ In his epistle to Paulinus he says, "Paul the apostle writes to seven churches ; for his eighth epistle to the Hebrews, is placed by *most* out of the number of his."§ And again, in his Comm. on Matt. xxvi. he

---

\* Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graece sermonis scriptoribus quasi apostoli Pauli suscipi ; licet plerique eam vel Barnabae, vel Clementis arbitrentur. Et nihil interesse cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quodsi autem Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, etc. Epist. ad Dardanum.

† Apud Romanos, usque hodie, quasi Pauli epistola non habetur. Opp. Tom. III. p. 46.

‡ Quam epistolam ad Hebraeos, omnes Graeci recipiunt, et *nonnulli* Latinorum. Epist. ad Evagrium.

§ Paulus apostolus ad septem ecclesias scribit ; octava enim ad Hebraeos a *plerisque* extra numerum ponitur. Epist. ad Paulinum.

says, "Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, although *many* of the Latins doubt concerning it, says, etc."\*

On a comparison of all these different passages together, the following appears to be the result of Jerome's testimony.

(1.) The majority of the Roman churches in his time, did not receive the epistle as Paul's; "it is placed by most out of the number of Paul's epistles."

(2.) But some of the Latin churches did receive it still, in accordance with the custom of the Greek i. e. oriental churches; *omnes Graeci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latinorum.*

(3.) The *reception* or *rejection* of this epistle, as described by Jerome, refers (one passage only excepted) to receiving it as Paul's, or refusing to admit Paul as the author. Jerome does not say, that the Roman churches condemned it as spurious. Nay, that he does not mean to say this, is very plain from his own express words; for after averring that "most persons [Romans] regard it as written either by Barnabas, or by Clement," he goes on to say, *nihil interesse cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur.* That is, it matters not about the person of the author, since he was an ecclesiastical man, and the churches every day read his epistle. But how much this means exactly, it is difficult to say; for the writer adds, *Quod si Latinorum consuetudo non recepit inter canonicas scripturas,* etc. By *canonical* Jerome seems to understand *apostolical*, or having that authority which the writings of an apostle has. So much is plain, then, viz. that in the day of this writer, the churches made a distinction between writings *apostolic* and *not apostolic*; and if so, it must have been by giving to the former a rank higher and more authoritative than the latter. On the whole, we must understand Jerome as meaning to aver, that while *some* of the Latin churches admitted Paul to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, and regarded this epistle as canonical in the highest sense, most of these churches doubted whether Paul was the author, and consequently gave the epistle

---

\* Paulus, in epistola sua quae scribitur ad Hebraeos, licet de ea *multi Latinorum* dubitent, etc. loc. cit.

but a secondary place in their canon ; or rather, they read it, with the other books of Scripture, for edification, but (probably) did not appeal to it as *authoritative*.

The testimony of Augustine corresponds well with this. “ *Many* say, that [the epistle to the Hebrews] is Paul’s ; but some deny it.”\* And again ; “ In the epistle to the Hebrews, which the illustrious defenders of the catholic faith use as a witness, faith is called etc.”†

The council at Carthage, held A. D. 397, reckon this epistle among the divine and canonical writings, and attribute it to Paul.‡

I have now traced the history of this epistle down to the fourth century, in the Egyptian, the Eastern, and the Western churches. Lower down it is altogether unnecessary to trace it ; as all admit that it has had a general currency in the Christian churches every where, since that period.

### § 17. *Result.*

We now come to the result of this investigation. In the Egyptian and Eastern churches, there were, it is probable, at a pretty early period, some who had doubts whether Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews ; but no *considerable* person or party is definitely known to us, who entertained these doubts ; and it is manifest, from Origen and Eusebius, that there was not, in that quarter, any important opposition to the general and constant tradition of the church, that Paul did write it. Not a single witness of any considerable respectability is named, who has given his voice, in this part of the church, for the negative of the question which we are considering. What Jerome avers, appears to be strictly true, viz. *ab ecclesiis Orientis et ab omnibus retro ec-*

---

\* *Plures* apostoli Pauli dicunt [sc. epistolam ad Hebræos] ; *quidam* vero negant. De Civitate Dei. XVI. 22.

† In epistola quippe ad Hebræos, qua teste usi sunt illustres catholice regulæ defensores, fides esse dicta est, etc. De Fide, Spe, et Caritate, c. VIII.

‡ Sunt autem canonice Scripturæ . . . . Pauli epistolæ tredecim, ejusdem ad Hebræos una. Cau. 47.

*clesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus, quasi apostoli Pauli suscipi.*

In the Western churches, a diversity of opinion prevailed ; although the actual quantity of negative testimony, that can be adduced, is not great. Yet the concessions of Jerome and Augustine leave no room to doubt the fact, that the *predominant* opinion of the western churches, in their times, was in the negative. In early times, we have seen that the case was different, when Clement of Rome wrote his epistle, and when the old Latin version was brought into circulation. What produced a change of opinion in the West, we are left to conjecture. The scanty critical and literary records of those times, afford us no means for tracing the history of it. But this is far from being a singular case. Many other changes in the opinions of the churches have taken place, which we are, for a similar reason, as little able to trace with any certainty or satisfaction.

Storr has endeavoured to shew, that Marcion occasioned this revolution, when he came from the East to Rome, and brought with him a collection of the sacred books, in which the epistle to the Hebrews was omitted. But it is very improbable, that an extravagant man, excommunicated by the Roman church itself, should have produced such a revolution there in sentiment. Others have, with more probability, attributed it to the zealous disputes at Rome against the Montanist party ; whom the epistle to the Hebrews was supposed particularly to favour. The Montanists strenuously opposed the reception again into the bosom of the church, those persons who had so lapsed as to make defection from the Christian faith. The passages, in Heb. VI. 4—8 and X. 26—31, at least seem strongly to favour the views which they maintained. The church at Rome carried the dispute against the Montanists very high ; and Ernesti and many other critics, have been led to believe, that the epistle to the Hebrews was ultimately rejected by them, because the Montanists relied on it as their main support.

As a matter of fact, this cannot be established by direct historical evidence. But, in the absence of all testimony in respect to this subject, it must be allowed as not improbable, that the epistle to the Hebrews may have, in this way, become obnoxious

to the Romish church. Many such instances might be produced, from the history of the church. The Ebionites, the Manicheans, the Alogi, and many ancient and modern sects, have rejected some part of the canon of Scripture, because it stood opposed to their party views. The Apocalypse was rejected by many of the oriental churches, on account of their opposition to the Chiliasts, who made so much use of it. And who does not know, that Luther himself rejected the epistle of James, because he viewed it as thwarting his favourite notions of *justification*; yea, that he went so far as to give it the appellation of *epistola straminea*? It cannot be at all strange, then, that the Romish church, exceedingly embittered by the dispute with the Montanists, should have gradually come to call in question the apostolic origin of our epistle; because it was, to their adversaries, a favourite source of appeal, and because (unlike Paul's other epistles) it was anonymous.

That *all* even of the Montanists, however, admitted the apostolic origin of our epistle, does not seem to be true. Tertullian, who took a very active part in favour of this sect, had, as we have already seen, doubts of such an origin; or rather, he ascribed it to Barnabas.

But whatever might have been the cause, that the epistle in question was pretty generally rejected, by the churches of the West, the *fact* that it was so, cannot be reasonably disputed. A majority of these churches, from the latter half of the second century to the latter half of the fourth, seem to have been generally opposed to receiving this epistle as Paul's; although there were some among them who did receive it.

It remains, then, to balance the testimony thus collected together and compared. The *early* testimony is, of course, immeasurably the most important. And there seems to me sufficient evidence, that this was as general and as uniform, for the first century after the apostolic age, as in respect to many other books of the New Testament; and more so, than in respect to several. I cannot hesitate to believe, that THE WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE FROM TRADITION, IS ALTOGETHER PREPONDERANT IN FAVOUR OF THE OPINION, THAT PAUL WAS THE AUTHOR OF OUR EPISTLE.

§ 18. *Internal evidence that the epistle is Paul's.*

We come, then, next to inquire, whether the *internal condition* of the epistle corresponds with and confirms this tradition. The evidence drawn from this, may be divided into two kinds; first, *that which arises from circumstances mentioned or adverted to in the epistle*; and secondly, *that which arises from the style and manner of it.*

§ 19. *Evidence that it was Paul's, from circumstances mentioned or adverted to in the epistle.*

As our epistle no where exhibits the author's name, we can appeal, for internal testimony respecting the author of it, only to accidental circumstances which are developed in it.

(1.) The most striking one, is that contained in 13: 23, "Know ye, that our brother Timothy is ἀπολελυμένον, with whom, if he come speedily, I will pay you a visit." From the first acquaintance of Timothy with Paul, he had been his intimate friend and constant companion. That he was with Paul at Rome, during his imprisonment, we know for certainty; because Paul has united him in the salutation prefixed to the epistles written to the Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon, during his captivity in that city. Timothy was greatly beloved and confided in by Paul, as the manner in which he speaks of him, in several of his epistles, abundantly shews; and Paul often calls him (as here) his *brother*. But the meaning of the word ἀπολελυμένον, as applied to Timothy, has been much contested; some rendering it, *set at liberty* i. e. from prison; others, *sent away* i. e. on some errand of Paul's. Giving to ἀπολελυμένον the first meaning assigned it, viz. *liberated*, objectors have said, that 'we have no account of Timothy's having been imprisoned during the life of Paul, and therefore, the occurrence of his imprisonment must have taken place after Paul's death; consequently the epistle must have been written by some *other* friend of Timothy, who

calls him *brother*, in accordance with the usual style of the primitive Christians.'

Nothing, however, can be more unsafe or uncritical, than the supposition that the Acts of the Apostles, or Paul's epistles, give us a *full* and *complete* account, of all which happened to the various persons who are named in them. E. g. Aristarchus is called by Paul, in Col. 4:10, his fellow prisoner; as is Epaphras in Philem. v. 23; but where is the history of their imprisonment? The supposition by Bertholdt, that another Timothy, different from him who is so often mentioned in the sacred records, may be meant here, is doubtless a *possible* one; but is it a *probable* one? Have we any kind of ecclesiastical voucher, that there was another Timothy, who distinguished himself in the apostolic age? It is *possible* that one Virgil wrote the *Eneid*, and another the *Georgics*; yet who thinks it to be *probable*? But if this be insufficient, Bertholdt alleges that a different person from Paul may have been the intimate friend and travelling companion of Timothy, while Paul was imprisoned at Rome; and that the passage we are considering, may have come from him. Eichhorn thinks it must have been written by such a friend of Timothy, after the death of Paul; as during his life Timothy closely adhered to this apostle. All this no doubt, is *possible*; and a great many other hypotheses, which could be easily made, present no *impossibility*. But are they *probable*? And is not the language, which we are considering, more appropriate to the known relation of Paul and Timothy, than to the relation of any other person of that period with Timothy, concerning whom we have any knowledge? The spontaneous feeling of Christian readers, in all ages, has fully answered this question.

But what was the imprisonment which is adverted to, by the word *ἀπολελυμένον*? To suppose with Schmidt, (Hist. Antiq. Canon.), and many others, that it was an imprisonment at Rome with Paul, is evidently preposterous; for how, if Timothy were already at Rome, could Paul, or any one else there say, *if he come, or return, speedily*? Must not Timothy have been *absent*, when this was said? If Timothy had been imprisoned abroad, and was then *liberated* (*ἀπολελυμένον*), would he not have been the immediate bearer of the news himself to the apostle? I do

not allege this as a certain fact, for possibly there may have been circumstances to prevent it. But then, it is not in itself very probable, that Paul in confinement at Rome would obtain information about Timothy, (who if absent was doubtless among some of the churches where Paul had been), any sooner than those to whom he wrote our epistle; and who, as it appears from the manner in which Paul speaks of him to them, had a special regard for him.

Why, moreover, raise up all these difficulties in order to maintain an interpretation of ἀπολιπεμένον which accords no better with the *usus loquendi* of the sacred or classical writers, than the rendering, *dismissed* or *sent away*? a sense so exactly consensaneous with the relation between Paul and Timothy. See Schleus. in voc. ἀπολύω no. 3. In Philip. 2: 19, (this epistle was written while Paul was a prisoner at Rome), the apostle speaks of sending Timothy to them shortly, so soon as he should see how it would go with him, in respect to being liberated from prison, 2: 23; at the same time expressing a hope, that he should himself come to them shortly, v. 24. What then is more natural than the supposition, that he did send Timothy to them; and that, during his absence, Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, in which he tells them, that Timothy was sent away, that he is now assured that he himself would be speedily set at liberty, and that he intends to pay them a visit in company with Timothy, if he should shortly return, viz. from Philippi? Many facts are believed by Bertholdt, and all other critics, which have less of verisimilitude to support them than this. Indeed, one cannot well see, how mere circumstantial evidence could be better adapted to make the impression of *probability* than this.

I do not feel the weight of the objection, made by alleging that Timothy was unknown to the church in Palestine, and that they could have no special interest with respect to the information in question. For, first, Timothy was the well known and beloved companion of Paul, in all his journeyings during his later years; and must have been known as such, wherever Paul was known. Next, there can be no reasonable question, that he was with Paul during his last visit to Jerusalem, previously to the



apostle's captivity for two years at Cesarea. Is there any probability, even if he were not with Paul during his journey to Jerusalem, that he did not frequently visit him in his afflictions? And would not the church at Cesarea, therefore, be well acquainted with him? Specially so, as Timothy would be the more acceptable to the Palestine Jewish Christians, on account of his having received the rite of circumcision, after he became a convert to Christianity.

Now as all these circumstances do plainly accord with Paul's situation, while a prisoner at Rome; with his relation to Timothy; and with the manner in which he employed him; and as we have not a syllable of testimony that they are applicable to any other person; I do not see how we can be justified, in denying that the evidence deducible from them is sufficient to render it quite probable, that Paul was the author of our epistle.

(2.) In Heb. 13: 18, 19, the writer asks the prayers of those whom he addressed, that he might speedily be restored to them; and in Heb. 13: 23, he expresses a confident expectation of "speedily paying them a visit." From these passages it is clear, that the writer was then in a state of imprisonment; and also, that he was assured of a speedy liberation, which would enable him to pay the visit that he had encouraged them to hope for.

Compare this, now, with the situation of Paul at Rome, during the latter part of his imprisonment there. In his epistle to the Philippians, (written during that period), he expresses his entire confidence that his life will be prolonged, so that he shall yet promote their religious profit and joy: *τοῦτο πεποιθώς οἶδα, ὅτι ἀπὸ καὶ σιταραμειῶ τασὲν ὑμῶν, εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν τροκοπήν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως.* Paul. 1: 25. Again, in Paul. 2: 24, he says, *πέποιθα δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ταχέως ἔλθωμαι.* *Trust in the Lord, that I myself shall speedily come [to you].* In the epistle to Philemon, (also written during the same imprisonment), he says, *ἐπιζῶ γάρ, ὅτι διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν.* *for I hope, that by your prayers I shall be restored to you,* v. 22. So confident was Paul of this, that he bids Philemon prepare lodgings for him, *ἐτοίμασε μοι ξενίαν.* v. 22.

It appears very plainly, then, from these passages, that the writer had a satisfactory assurance in his mind of being speedily set at liberty; although, it is probable, a *formal* declaration of his acquittal had not yet been made by the Roman emperor. This last conclusion I gather from Phil. 2: 23, where Paul declares to the church whom he is addressing, “that he shall send Timothy to them immediately, *ὡς ἂν ἀπίδω τὰ περὶ ἐμέ, whenever I shall know how my affairs issue.*” By this it appears, that he was in daily expectation of receiving *official* notice of the determination of the emperor in respect to his case, but that he had not yet received it. That he had private information, however, of the way in which his case was likely to terminate, and information which pretty fully satisfied his mind, is evident from the manner in which he speaks, in the passages quoted above, of his intended visit to the Philippians, and to Philemon.

Supposing now, as soon as an intimation was made by the Roman emperor, that Paul would be set at liberty, that intelligence respecting it was immediately communicated to the apostle, by *those of Cesar’s household* (Phil. 4: 22), who were his Christian friends; and supposing that, agreeably to his promise made to the Philippians 2: 23, he then immediately sent away Timothy to them; and supposing still further, (which surely cannot be regarded as improbable), that there was some little delay in *formally* making out his sentence of acquittal, and carrying it into execution by actually liberating him from prison; then how obviously easy and natural is the expression in Heb. 13: 23, “Know that our brother Timothy is sent away; with whom, if he speedily return, I shall pay you a visit?” On the supposition that the *close* of the epistle to the Hebrews was written at this juncture of time, nothing can be more probable, than that the promised mission of Timothy, adverted to in Phil. 2: 23, is referred to in Heb. 13: 23; and consequently that ἀπολελυμένον here means *sent away, dismissed*, (as all must acknowledge it *may* mean), and not, *liberated, or, set at liberty.*

The circumstances adverted to, or implied, in Heb. 13: 23, Phil. 2: 23, and Philem. v. 22, have other correspondencies which deserve particular notice. In the two latter passages, it

is plain that the writer *expects* his liberty, and means to send away Timothy to Philippi. In the former, he is *assured* of his liberty, and only waits for the return of Timothy, in order that he may set out to visit the Hebrews whom he had been addressing. In case Timothy did not return *speedily* (τάχιον), it is plainly implied in Heb. 13: 23, that the writer meant to set out on his journey without him. There was, then, some uncertainty in his mind, respecting the time when Timothy would return. How well all this accords, with the journey of Timothy to a place so remote from Rome as Philippi, cannot fail to strike the mind of every considerate reader.

Now laying aside all favoritism for any previous opinions respecting our epistle, can it be reasonably doubted, that here is a concurrence of circumstances so striking, as to render it highly probable that Paul wrote it? More especially so, when we consider that the epistle must have been written, about the same period of time when these circumstances happened; for it proffers internal evidence of being written before the destruction of Jerusalem; and yet written so late, that the period when the Hebrews were first converted to Christianity is adverted to as being already a considerable time before, Heb. 5: 12, and is called *πρότερον ἡμεῶν*, 10: 32. Now the imprisonment of Paul, at Rome, happened probably A. D. 62 or 63, which was some thirty years after the gospel had begun to be preached abroad, and about seven years before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Taking all these circumstances together, it must be acknowledged that there is an extraordinary concurrence of them, which cannot but serve much to increase the probability that our epistle was written by Paul, near the close of his liberation at Rome.

The objections which Bertholdt makes against the arguments just presented, do not seem to be weighty. “Would Paul,” he asks, “promise to revisit Palestine, when the people of that very country had sent him into captivity at Rome? A very improbable circumstance, indeed!”

But a nearer consideration of the circumstances attending Paul’s case, will remove the appearance of so great improbability. For, first, Paul had been kept a prisoner, at Cesarea, two

years before his removal to Rome, Acts 24: 25—27; and at Rome he lived two years more, in a similar condition, Acts 28: 30. These, with the time occupied by his going to Rome, and returning from it, would make nearly a five years interval between his leaving Palestine and revisiting it. Might not some of his fiercest persecutors have died during this period? Or, might they not have laid aside their furious, persecuting zeal?

But, in the next place, supposing our epistle to have been sent to the church at Cesarea, where Paul had been treated with so much kindness during his imprisonment; could there have been any fear in his mind, with respect to paying them a visit? And even if we suppose that Cesarea was not the place to which the letter was directed, but that it was sent to the Christians at Jerusalem; yet the objection brought forward by Bertholdt will not be of much validity. Paul was not to be deterred from going to Jerusalem, by the prospect of persecution. From the time when he first made his appearance there, after his conversion, the Jews had always showed a bitter enmity against him, and persecuted him. Yet this did not deter him from going, again and again, to that city. And why should it now deter him, any more than formerly?

Besides, he was now liberated from the accusations of the Jews, by the sentence of the emperor himself. Would they venture to do again, the very thing which the court of Rome had decided to be unlawful? Might not Paul well expect, with the decision of the emperor in his hand, to find his personal liberty for the future respected?

“But,” says Bertholdt, “we have no account that Paul paid a visit to Palestine, after his liberation.”

True. But what argument this can furnish, against the probability that he did pay such a visit, I do not perceive. Bertholdt himself, in the very paragraph which contains this objection, says, “Who does not know, that the accounts of what befel the apostles, and primitive teachers of Christianity, are very incomplete?” Every one knows, that Luke breaks off the history of Paul, with the account of his imprisonment at Rome. Has any writer given us a well authenticated *supplement* to this? And can the want

of any history of Paul, after the period of his imprisonment at Rome, be a proof that he never travelled to any particular place, or that he did not live and preach there? Surely this cannot be urged with any shew of propriety.

I add only, that analogy would lead us to suppose that Paul, when liberated, would go to Palestine, and then to the other churches in Asia Minor. Such was the general course of his travels; see Acts 18: 22, seq. It is altogether consonant, then, with the usage of Paul, to suppose that he would visit the church at Palestine, after his imprisonment at Rome; and therefore natural to suppose that Heb. 13: 23, refers to such an event.

(3.) If the reading in Heb. 10: 34, “for ye had compassion on my bonds (τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου),” be correct, it is another argument that Paul is the author of our epistle; for his bonds in Palestine, whither the letter was sent, are well known. That he obtained compassion there, particularly during his two years imprisonment at Cesarea, will not be questioned. But as the reading δεσμοῖς μου is controverted, and δεσμίοις (*the prisoners*) is preferred by some good critics, I do not think proper to urge this argument; although the evidence is about equally in favour of δεσμοῖς μου, δεσμοῖς, and δεσμίοις.

(4.) The salutation, in Heb. 13: 24, agrees with the supposition that Paul wrote this epistle; ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. Paul, writing from Rome, which had communication of course with all parts of Italy, and with the Italian churches, may very naturally be supposed to have sent such a salutation. Indeed, the circumstances render this quite probable.

The objections made against this, do not strike me as forcible. Eichhorn alleges, that οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας must mean, *people who had come from Italy*, i. e. who had left Italy, and were *locally* out of it, when the writer sent a salutation from them. Consequently, he concludes, the writer of the epistle could not have been Paul, during his imprisonment at Rome.

This interpretation, however, is not founded in the *usus loquendi* of the Greek language. From the many proofs of this, which might be offered, I select only a few cases. Matt. 21: 11, Ἰησοῦς . . . ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, *Jesus the Nazarene*; Acts 17: 13,

οἱ ἀπὸ Θεσσαλονίκης Ἰουδαῖοι, *the Thessalonian Jews*. In this last case, the Jews *at* Thessalonica, not *out of* it, are meant; as is plain from the last part of the verse, which speaks of them as going to Berea, *after* they had heard the report of Paul's preaching there. So οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων γραμματεῖς, *the Jerusalem scribes*, Matt. 15: 1.

In the same manner, other prepositions, of the like signification with ἀπό, are used with the article, e. g. οἱ ἐκ ἐριθείας, *the contentious*; οἱ ἐκ νόμου, *sticklers for the law*; τὸ ἐξ οὐράνου, *heavenly*; οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας, *Caesar's domestics*.

So far is Eichhorn's remark from being well founded, in regard to the meaning of such a phrase as οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, that one may venture to say, it is incapable of such a meaning as he gives it. It is only when ἀπό in such a connexion, is preceded by ἀγίστημι, ἀναβαίνω, ἐξέρχομαι, ἔρχομαι, καταβαίνω, etc. that it denotes, *being out of a country*. Οἱ ἀπό denotes, *belonging to*. Consequently the salutation in Heb. 13: 24, means simply, *The Italians* [i. e. Italian Christians] *salute you*.

But here again, it is asked, 'How came Italians to salute a church in Palestine? If Paul wrote our epistle, at *Rome*, why did he not say, ἀσπάζονται ἡμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης! What acquaintance had the *Romans* with the church at Palestine?

This objection, however, will not bear examination. The Romans surely were *Italians*; and it is a matter of indifference, whether the writer at Rome said, οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης, or οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, if he meant to send only the salutation of Christians who resided at Rome. But is it at all probable, that there were not Christians often at Rome, from various parts of Italy, who were acquainted with Paul, and who cherished a friendly interest for the church whom he was addressing? If these also, as well as the *Romans*, wished to send the expression of their friendly regards to the Hebrews; what other phraseology could Paul have adopted, that would be more appropriate than οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, which would embrace Christians in general, who lived in the country where the writer was?

Then, why should this be thought so strange, when an example of the very same nature may be produced from the acknowl-

edged writings of Paul? This apostle, writing from Ephesus (1 Cor. 16: 8), to the church at Corinth, says, *The churches of Asia salute you*, 16: 19. May not the same questions be urged here, as objectors urge in the case above? May we not ask, How could the Asiatics be *personally* known to the Corinthians? And why should Paul speak of *the churches of Asia*, and not of that at Ephesus? Plainly, the reason of this was, that Christians from different parts of Asia minor, (which is here meant), were collected together in Ephesus its capital, where they had intercourse with Paul, and knew that he was addressing the Corinthians, and desired an expression of their brotherly affection toward them. What is more common, every day, than for single individuals, or societies of men, who have never had any personal intercourse together, to exchange friendly salutations? Could not Paul as well send the salutations of *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδας*, as of *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας*?

Such are the various circumstances adverted to in our epistle, which serve to render it probable that Paul was the author of it. From its nature, this evidence is *indirect*; but evidence of such a kind is, not unfrequently, as convincing as that which appears to be more direct. The prefixing or suffixing a writer's name to an epistle, is a more easy and obvious method of interpolation, than the insertion of minute circumstances, which imply a very intimate acquaintance with a writer's condition and circumstances.

Will any one undertake to show, that the circumstances, which are brought into view above, may be more probably attached to some other person than to Paul? If not, then the probability from them is in favour of Paul as the author of our epistle.

§ 20. *Evidence that the epistle is Paul's, from a similarity of sentiment, and also from the form, method, style, and diction of the composition.*

The preceding section treated of the facts or external circumstances, to which various passages of our epistle adverts; and what is gathered from these may be called, in a certain respect,

a kind of *external* evidence. But a comparison of our epistle with the other acknowledged writings of Paul, remains yet to be made. This is a species of evidence, on which some have relied with great confidence; and it is remarkable, that it has been appealed to with equal confidence, both by those who defend, and by those who assail, the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews. Even in very ancient times, so early as the third century, the same occurrence took place. One might, perhaps, naturally enough conclude from this, that no very satisfactory evidence on either side would be obtained: but that the epistle contains things to which both parties may appeal, with some tolerable show of reason. Before coming however to such a conclusion, we ought at least to make a thorough investigation, and to weigh well all the arguments, which are adduced to support the respective opinions to which I allude.

A comparison between our epistle and the acknowledged letters of Paul, may have respect to the *doctrines taught in both*; or to the *form and method*, as well as the *style and diction*, of the epistle. When these shall have passed in review before us, the allegations, with regard to a *dissimilarity* between the epistle to the Hebrews and other epistles of Paul, may be further discussed.

§ 21. *Similarity of DOCTRINES between the epistle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epistles of Paul.*

Are the sentiments, in our epistle, such as Paul was wont to teach? Do they accord with his, not only in such a general way as we may easily suppose the sentiments of all Christians in the apostolic age harmonized with each other, but have they the colouring, the proportion, the characteristic features of Paul's sentiments? Are they so stated and insisted on, as Paul is wont to state and insist on his?

The resemblance in respect to doctrine may be arranged, for the sake of perspicuity and distinction, under the following heads.

I. General preference of Christianity over Judaism.

There can, indeed, be no reasonable doubt, that all the apostles and primitive teachers of Christianity, who were well instruct-



ed in the principles of this religion, must have acknowledged and taught its superiority over the ancient religion of the Jews. The very fact, that they were Christians, necessarily implies this. But still, it is quite certain, that the preference of the new over the ancient religion, is taught by Paul, in a manner different from that of other writers of the New Testament; and with more emphasis, in his writings, than in any other parts of the sacred volume.

The grounds of preferring Christianity to Judaism, may be classed under the following particulars.

(1.) *The superior degree of light, or religious knowledge, imparted by the gospel.*

In his acknowledged epistles, Paul calls Judaism, *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, Gal. 4: 3; and again, *τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα*, Gal. 4: 9. He represents it as adapted to children, *νήπιοι*, Gal. 4: 3, who are in a state of nonage and pupilage, Gal. 4: 2, or in the condition of servants rather than that of heirs, Gal. 4: 1.

On the other hand, Christians attain to a higher knowledge of God, Gal. 4: 9; they are no more as servants, but become sons, and obtain the privileges of adoption, Gal. 4: 5, 6. They are represented as *τέλειοι*, 1 Cor. 14: 20; as being furnished with instruction adequate to make them *ἄνδρας τέλειους*, Eph. 4: 11—13. Christianity leads them to see the glorious displays of himself which God has made, with an unveiled face, i. e. clearly, 2 Cor. 3: 18; while Judaism threw a veil over these things, 2 Cor. 2: 13. Christianity is engraven on the hearts of its votaries, *ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος*, 2 Cor. 3: 8; while Judaism was engraven on tablets of stone, *ἐντετυπωμένη ἐν λίθοις*, 2 Cor. 3: 7.

Such is a brief sketch of Paul's views in respect to this point, as presented in his acknowledged epistles. Let us now compare these views, with those which the epistle to the Hebrews discloses.

This epistle commences with the declaration, that God, who in times past spake to the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these last days, spoken to us by his Son, Heb. 1: 1. 2: 1 seq. Judaism was revealed only by the mediation of angels, 2: 2; while Christianity was revealed by the Son of God, and abundantly confirmed by miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, 2: 3, 4. The

ancient covenant was imperfect, in respect to the means which it furnished for the diffusion of knowledge ; but the new covenant provides that all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, 8: 9—11. The law was only a sketch or imperfect representation of religious blessings ; while the gospel proffers the blessings themselves, 10: 1. The worthies of ancient times had only imperfect views of spiritual blessings ; while Christians enjoy them in full measure, 11: 39, 40.

(2.) *The gospel holds out superior motives and encouragements to virtue and piety.*

Paul represents the condition of the Jews, while under the law, as like to that of children, immured and kept under the eye of masters and teachers, Gal. 3: 23. 4: 2 ; as being in bondage, Gal. 4: 3 ; as servants, 4: 1 ; as children, 4: 3 ; and as having the spirit of bondage, Rom. 8: 15. This servile spirit, which inspired them with fear, Rom. 8: 15, gives place, under the Christian religion, to the spirit of adoption, by which they approach God with filial confidence, Rom. 8: 15—17. Christianity has liberated us from pedagogues, and made us partakers of the privileges of sons and heirs, Gal. 3: 25 seq. 4: 4 seq. The liberty of the gospel affords urgent motives for the practice of virtue, Gal. 5: 1 seq. 5: 13 seq. The spirit imparted under the gospel furnishes aid, and creates special obligation, to mortify our evil passions and affections, Rom. 8: 12—17. Circumcision is now nothing, and uncircumcision nothing ; but obedience to the commands of God is the all important consideration, 1 Cor. 7: 19. Not circumcision or uncircumcision is matter of concern, under the Christian religion, but a new creation, i. e. a spiritual renovation, Gal. 6: 15, and faith which worketh by love, Gal. 5: 6.

Turn we now to the epistle to the Hebrews. There we find, that the sacrifices prescribed by the Jewish law could not quiet and purify the conscience of the worshipper, 9: 9 ; nor deliver him from the pollution of sin, in order that he might, in a becoming manner, worship the living God ; which is effected only under the gospel, 9: 14. The law served to inspire its votaries with awe and terror, Heb. 12: 18—21 ; but the gospel with cheering confidence, 12: 22—24. Now we may obtain

grace to serve God in an acceptable manner, 12: 28. We have a covenant established on better promises than the ancient one, 8: 6—13; and are urged by more powerful motives to a holy life under the gospel, 12: 25—29.

It must be admitted, in respect to the particulars of the comparison just drawn, that the *diction* of the passages generally, in the epistle to the Hebrews, presents no very striking resemblances to that in Paul's acknowledged epistles. But this, as will be easily seen by inspecting all the passages drawn into the comparison, may very naturally result from the different topics with which the passages from our epistle stand connected. The *mode* of introducing these topics is different, because it arises from different occasions of introducing them. But the fundamental ideas in both are the same. Other writers also of the New Testament urge the obligations of Christians to peculiar holiness of life; but what other writers, except Paul, urge it from *comparative* views of the Jewish and Christian dispensations?

(.) *The superior efficacy of the gospel, in promoting and ensuring the real and permanent happiness of mankind.*

Paul represents the law as possessing only a condemning power, and subjecting all men to its curse, in consequence of disobedience, Gal. 3: 10. It is the ministry of death, 2 Cor. 3: 7; the ministry of condemnation, 2 Cor. 3: 9; by it none can obtain justification or pardoning mercy, Gal. 3: 11. Rom. 3: 20.

On the contrary, Christianity is the ministry of pardon, *τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, 2 Cor. 3: 9; it holds out forgiveness of sins for the sake of Christ, gratuitous pardon on account of him, Rom. 4: 24, 25. Eph. 1: 7. Through him, we are allowed to cherish the hope of future glory, Rom. 5: 1, 2; and this without perfect obedience to the law, Rom. 3: 21. Gal. 2: 16. Acts 13: 38, 39. And to such blessings, under the gospel, is attached a most important circumstance, in order to heighten their value, viz. that they are *perennial*, and not (like the Mosaic institutions) liable to abolition, 2 Cor. 3: 11.

In correspondence with all this, the epistle to the Hebrews represents the Mosaic dispensation, as one which was calculated to inspire awe and terror, Heb. 12: 18—21; the offerings and

sacrifices which it enjoined. could never tranquillize and purify the conscience of the worshipper, 9: 9 : for it was impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin. 10: 4. 11. The blood of Christ has made a real expiation. procured forgiveness, and liberated the conscience from an oppressive sense of guilt, 9: 11—14. 5: 9. 6: 15—20. Christ by his death has delivered us from the condemning power of sin. and freed us from the oppressive fear which it occasions, 2: 14. 15. He has procured access to God. and is ever ready to aid those who approach him, 7: 25. 9: 24. The offering which he has made for sin has a perennial influence, and without repetition remains forever efficacious, 9: 12, 25—25. 10: 12. 7: 23—25.

Other writers also of the New Testament have set before us the blessings of the gospel: and these, as connected with what Christ has done and suffered. But what other writer, except Paul, has charged his picture with such a contrast between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, and thrown so much shade over the one, and light over the other? If the hand of Paul be not in the epistle to the Hebrews, it is the hand of one who had drunk deeply of his doctrines, and in a high degree participated of his feelings and views.

(4.) *The Jewish dispensation was only a type and shadow of the Christian.*

Thus Paul often represents it. Meats and drinks, feasts and new moons and sabbaths, are *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*, but the *σῶμα* is Christ. Col. 2: 16, 17. The passage through the Red Sea was typical of Christian baptism: and the manna, of our spiritual food. 1 Cor. 10: 1—6. The occurrences under the ancient dispensation were typical of things under the new. 1 Cor. 10: 11. In like manner, Paul calls Adam *τύπος τοῦ μελλόντος*, i. e. a type of Christ. Rom. 5: 14. comp. 1 Cor. 15: 45—47. The Mosaic institution did but darkly shadow that, which is clearly revealed under the gospel. 2 Cor. 3: 13—15. Hagar and Sarah may be considered as allegorically representing the law and the gospel, or the two covenants. Gal. 4: 22—31. The law was only our pedagogue until the coming of Christ, under whom full privileges are enjoyed, Gal. 3: 23—25. 4: 1—5.

The epistle to the Hebrews, in like manner, represents the Jewish rites and ordinances only as a *παραβολή*, i. e. a *significant emblem* of blessings under the gospel; and these rites were imposed only until the time of reformation, 9: 9—14. The law was only *σκιά* of good things to come; while the gospel proffered the very things themselves, 10: 1. All the Levitical ritual, the temple itself and all its appurtenances, were only a *ὑπόδειγμα* of the temple in which Christ ministers, and of the functions which he performs, 8: 1—9. 9: 22—24; they were a designed emblem of the objects of the new dispensation, 9: 9.

The question may be emphatically put, here, What other parts of the New Testament, the writings of Paul excepted, furnish us with views of such a nature as these exhibit? Manifestly Pauline is both the sentiment, and the costume which the writer has put upon it.

(5.) *While the Christian dispensation is designed for perpetuity, the Jewish institutes are abolished on account of their imperfection.*

Paul represents the Law as having no glory, in comparison with Christianity, 2 Cor. 3: 10; it was designed to be abolished, when the perennial dispensation of Christ should be introduced, 2 Cor. 3: 11, 13. The veil over the ancient dispensation rendered it obscure, and hindered the Jews from fully comprehending it; but the time was come, under the gospel, when that veil was removed, and the glory of God was seen with open face, 2 Cor. 3: 13—18. The law being altogether incapable of justifying sinners, gives place to another and gratuitous method of justification, Rom. 4: 14—16. Christians are dead to the law, and affianced to another covenant, Rom. 7: 4—6. The law was incompetent to effect the designs of divine benevolence, and therefore gives place to a more perfect dispensation, Gal. 3: 21—25. 4: 1—7, 5: 1. It was void of power to justify the sinner, and therefore the interposition of Christ became necessary, Rom. 8: 3, 4. Gal. 2: 16.

On the other hand, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews represents the new covenant as inspiring better hopes than the ancient one did, and the latter as taxable with defects, 8: 6—8.

The old covenant is antiquated, and ready to expire, *ἐγγὺς ἀφαισμοῦ*, 8: 13. Christ is appointed high priest according to a new order of priesthood, different from the Levitical one; because the dispensation, by which the latter received its appointment, was weak, and incompetent to effect the introduction of such hopes as the gospel inspires, 7: 17—19. Burnt-offerings and sacrifices can never take away sin, Christ only can effect this; so that, when his offering is made, it needs not to be repeated, but is of sufficient and everlasting efficacy, 10: 1—14.

Other writers of the New Testament have also appealed to the efficacy of Jesus' atoning blood; but who, besides Paul, has thrown this whole subject into an attitude of contrast with the inefficiency of the Jewish dispensation?

Thus much for our first general head, by way of comparing the *sentiments* of Paul with those of our epistle, in respect to the grounds of preference over Judaism, which Christianity affords.

#### II. The person and work of the Mediator, Jesus Christ.

Under this head, the following particulars are entitled to our consideration;

(1.) *The PERSON of the Mediator is presented in the same light, by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, and by Paul.*

Paul, in various passages, represents Christ as the image of God, as the resemblance or likeness of the Father; as humbling himself, or condescending to assume our nature, and suffer death in it; and as being exalted in consequence of this, i. e. as a reward of his benevolence and obedience, to the throne of the universe, and made head over all things. Thus, in Philip. 2: 6—11, Christ being *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, took on himself our nature, and obeyed or subjected himself, in the same, unto death, even the death of the cross; in consequence of which God hath given him a name above every other, so that all in heaven or on earth must bow the knee to him. In Col. 1: 15—20, Christ is represented as the image of the invisible God; as having created all things in heaven and in earth; all things are said to consist by him; over all he has a distinguished preeminence; and by his sufferings and death he has produced a reconciliation among the

creatures of God, and made expiation for sin, so that God treats the pardoned sinner as if he were innocent. In 2 Cor. 8: 9, Paul says, that the Lord Jesus Christ, who was rich, became poor on our account, that we through his poverty might become rich. In Eph. 3: 9, God is said to have created all things by Jesus Christ; and in 1 Cor. 8: 6, all things are said to be by him. In 1 Cor. 15: 25—27, it is declared that he must reign until all things are put under his feet.

The peculiarity of this Pauline representation consists, in presenting Christ as the *image* of God; in specifying the act of humility by which he became incarnate, *he humbled himself*, ἐκένωσε σεαυτόν—*though rich he became poor*; in presenting his obedience and sufferings, as the ground of his elevation to the throne of the universe, in the mediatorial nature; in representing him as head over all, both friends and enemies, and as reigning until his enemies be made his footstool; and finally, in representing God as having created all things *by him*.

If we turn now to the epistle to the Hebrews, we find the same representations there. The Son of God is the reflection of the Father's glory, his exact image or resemblance, *χαρουκτήρ*, 1: 3. God made all things by him, 1: 2. He directs all things by his powerful word, 1: 3. He was in a state of humiliation (ἡλιτωμένον), lower than the angels, 2: 9. He took part in flesh and blood, that he might, by his own death, render null and void the destructive power of the devil, 2: 14. On account of the suffering of death, he is exalted to a state of glory and honour, 2: 9. He endured the sufferings of the cross, making no account of its disgrace, but having a regard to the reward set before him, which was a seat at the right hand of God, 12: 2. All things are put under his feet, 2: 8. 10: 13; where the very same passage from the Old Testament is quoted, which Paul quotes in 1 Cor. 15: 25—28, and it is applied in the same manner.

Is all this, now, mere *accident*? What other writer of the New Testament presents such speciality of views respecting Christ's resemblance to God, his mediatorial character, his obedience, sufferings, and exaltation in our nature to the throne of the universe? No other writer presents them in the same connex-

ion, employs the same images for comparison, or brings the topics to view in the same light. There is a peculiarity of representation so distinctly marked here, so exclusively Pauline in its manner, that if Paul himself did not write the epistle to the Hebrews, it must have been some one, who had drunk in so deeply of his instructions, as to become the very image of the fountain whence he drew.

(2.) *The death of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, and the reconciliation of sinners to God by means of this sacrifice.*

Other writers, indeed, of the New Testament, besides Paul, teach this doctrine. But there is in his letters, a peculiar and urgent manner of enforcing it. Oftener than any other writer, does he recur to this interesting theme; and in all his representations, it stands in high relief.

The general annunciation of it is often repeated. Christ came into the world to save sinners, 1 Tim. 1: 15. He died for our sins, 1 Cor. 15: 3. He was given up or devoted to death, on our account, Rom. 8: 32. Our redemption was wrought by him, Rom. 3: 24. He was given up, i. e. to death, on account of our offences, Rom. 4: 25. He gave up himself for our sins, Gal. 1: 4. 2: 20. He gave up himself an acceptable sacrifice for us, Eph. 5: 2. He was our paschal lamb, 1 Cor. 5: 7. By his blood we have redemption or forgiveness of sin, Eph. 1: 7. Col. 1: 14. He gave himself a ransom for all, 1 Tim. 2: 6. 1 Cor. 6: 20. 7: 23. These may serve as a specimen of the general statement, which Paul so frequently makes of this subject.

But he also recurs very often to this topic, in his reasonings at length, and insists upon it with particularity. In his epistle to the Romans, he labours at length to prove the universal guilt of men, in order to show that salvation by Christ is necessary for all, Rom. 3: 22—27. 5: 12—21. He urges the impossibility of obtaining this salvation by the law, Rom. 3: 20, 28. 8: 3. Gal. 2: 16, 21, averring that Jesus, by his death, has effected what the law could not do. Assuming our nature, he became a sin-offering for us, Rom. 8: 3. He became a propitiatory sacrifice on our account, so that through him we may obtain pardoning mercy, Rom. 3: 24—26. As all men have come into a state



of condemnation through Adam, so all men may come into a state of pardon through Christ, Rom. 5: 12—21, comp. 2 Cor. 5: 14, 19—21. Now, since Christ died for us, Christians may regard God as no more inclined to punish them as guilty, for they are in a state of peace and pardon, Rom. 5: 1, 8—11. 8: 32. Now we may hope for abounding grace and happiness, Rom. 5: 17. 6: 23. 8: 17, 32. Jesus at the right hand of God is ever ready to aid us, Rom. 8: 34. Jesus is the Mediator between God and man, to make reconciliation, 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6.

It were easy to add many other passages of the same tenor, from the acknowledged writings of Paul; but these are sufficient to exhibit his views, and the mode in which he inculcates them.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, we find the same sentiments, urged with the same ardour. Christ, by the sacrifice of himself, made expiation for our sins, 1: 3. By the grace of God, assuming our nature, he tasted death for all, 2: 9. He became, through his sufferings, the author of eternal salvation to believers, 5: 8, 9.

But no where is there more speciality of argument to establish this great point, than in Heb. vii. viii. ix. and x. ; nearly all of which is occupied with it. The Jewish offerings are altogether insufficient to make expiation, 9: 9—14. 7: 11, 19. 10: 1, 11. Those offerings needed constant repetition; and even then, they could never remove sin, 5: 1—3. 7: 27, 28. 9: 6, 7, 25. 10: 4, 11. Christ by offering up himself has effected this, 1: 3. 7: 27. 9: 25, 26. By his own blood, not with that of beasts, he entered into the eternal sanctuary, once for all making expiation for sin, 9: 12—15. 10: 10—12, 14, 19. By his death he has delivered us from the oppressive fear of condemnation, 2: 14, 15. He has tranquillized and purified the conscience of penitent sinners, which the law could not do, 9: 9, 14. He is the mediator of a new covenant, 9: 15. 12: 24; which is better than the ancient one, 7: 22. 8: 6. He is exalted to the throne of the universe, 2: 6—10; and he is ever ready and able to assist us, 4: 14—16. 7: 25. He has introduced us to a dispensation, which speaks not terror only, like the law, but offers abounding grace and happiness, 12: 18—29.

Such are some of the more striking *traits of doctrine*, and *peculiarities in the mode of representing them*, common to the acknowledged epistles of Paul and to the epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 22. *Form and method of the epistle to the Hebrews, compared with those of Paul's acknowledged epistles.*

These topics may be considered, either in a general point of view, as it respects the arrangement of the epistle at large; or specially, as having reference to various particulars which it exhibits.

(1.) *The general method or arrangement of this epistle, is like to that of Paul.*

Most of all does it resemble his two epistles to the Romans, and to the Galatians; which exhibit first a theoretical or doctrinal, then a practical part. The epistle to the Romans is principally occupied, to the end of the tenth chapter, with the doctrinal part; and the remainder with practical matter and salutations. In like manner, the epistle to the Galatians, as far as the end of the fourth chapter, is principally doctrinal discussion; while the remainder is hortatory and practical. In some degree, the same thing may be said of the epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Thessalonians. But that to the Romans is most distinctly marked of all.

Turning now to the epistle to the Hebrews, we find that it is composed on a similar plan. As far as chapter 10:19, it is principally doctrinal. It has, however, like Paul's other epistles, occasional exhortation intermixed, which the strength of the writer's feelings plainly appears to have forced from him. Hence to the end, it is hortatory and practical.

In the epistle to the Romans, just before the salutatory part begins, the writer earnestly asks for a special interest in the prayers of those whom he addressed, in order that he may be delivered from the power of persecution; and he follows this request with a petition, that the God of peace might be with them, and concludes with an *Amen*, Rom. 15:30—33. The very same order, petition, style, and conclusion appear at the close of

the epistle to the Hebrews, 13: 18—21. The writer begs an interest in their prayers, that he may be restored to them the sooner; commends them to the *God of peace*, (an expression used nowhere else but in Paul's writings and in the epistle to the Hebrews); and concludes with an *Amen*, before the salutation.

Is all this arrangement, to which we have now adverted, merely *accidental*; or does it look, as if it must have come from the hand of the same writer? I know, indeed, it has been said, that the order of nature and propriety would lead every man, writing an epistle which contained doctrinal discussion and practical exhortation, to arrange them in such a manner that the former should precede; and that this arrangement, therefore, cannot with probability be represented as exclusively *Pauline*. With the views of rhetorical propriety, which are entertained by classical scholars of the present day, I readily acknowledge that such an order is almost spontaneous. But then, another question arises here. Why has not Paul adopted this in all his epistles? And why has neither John, nor James, nor Peter, nor Jude adopted it? All these apostles have commingled doctrine and practice, throughout their epistles. *Regularly* arranged discussion of doctrine, they do not exhibit. In this respect, the only similars to the epistle to the Hebrews, are to be found in the epistles of Paul. But if the general arrangement here adverted to, be not considered as of much weight in the matter before us, it must be admitted, that there is a striking resemblance between the close of the practical part, just before the salutations or greetings, in the epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. Here, also, we find the exclusively Pauline phrase, *the God of peace*, employed in the same way, in both epistles.

(2.) *The manner of appealing to and employing the Jewish Scriptures, in Paul's acknowledged epistles and in the epistle to the Hebrews, is the same.*

I do not refer here to the *formulas* of quotation, by which a passage from the Old Testament is introduced. I have compared those formulas presented by the epistle to the Hebrews, with those in Paul's epistles; but I do not find any thing peculiar enough in either, to mark Paul's writings with any certainty; as I

shall endeavour to show, in its proper place. Every where, in the New Testament, a great variety of such formulas is found, as also in the epistles of Paul. I refer now, in a particular manner, to the *method* in which, and the *frequency* with which, the Jewish Scriptures are employed; and that in a similar way, both in the epistle to the Hebrews, and in the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Paul often quotes and combines passages of Scripture, without any notice of quotations; e. g. Rom. 9: 7, 21. 10: 6—8, 18. 11: 33, 34. 13: 9. In Rom. 3: 10—18, several passages from different parts of the Scriptures are combined together, without any notice that this is done. In the same manner, does the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews proceed; e. g. 3: 2. 6: 14. x. and xi. throughout; also, in 12: 5, 6, 12, 13, and 13: 6, quotations, with a general appeal, are made from different parts of Scripture connected together. Paul makes a very frequent and copious use of the Jewish Scriptures, in all the argumentative part of his epistles: so does the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. Paul often appeals to the Jewish Scriptures, as *prophetically* declaring the abrogation of the Mosaic economy, and to Abraham, as having received a covenant which the law could not annul; the same does the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. Paul employs the Old Testament, in every way in which the Jews of that time were usually accustomed to reason from it. Sometimes he appeals to direct and prophetic assurances; sometimes to similarity of sentiment; sometimes he accommodates passages, which in the original have a local or temporary meaning, to designate something then extant, or happening at the time in which he wrote; sometimes he appeals to the history of the Old Testament, for analogical cases to confirm or impress the doctrine or truth which he inculcates; and sometimes he uses the Old Testament language as a vehicle of thought, in order to express his own ideas. The very same traits characterise, in a most visible manner, the method in which the Old Testament is employed throughout the epistle to the Hebrews; as every attentive reader must plainly see, without my delaying here to specify individual cases.

In a particular manner does Paul employ passages of the

Jewish Scripture, and Scripture history, κατ' ἀνθρώπων; in other words, he uses them by way of *argumentum ad hominem* or *argumentum ex concessis*. It is thus that he allegorizes, on the two sons of Sarah and Hagar, in Gal. 4: 24, seq; on the command of Moses, not to muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn, Deut. 25: 4, the spirit of which he applies to the maintenance of religious teachers, in 1 Cor. 9: 9; on the rock from which the Israelites obtained water, Ex. 17: 6, which he considers as an emblem of Christ, in 1 Cor. 10: 2, seq.; on the veil over Moses' face, Ex. 34: 33, which he applies to the comparative obscurity that rested on the Jewish revelation, in 2 Cor. 3: 13, 14; on the declaration that a man should leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and that they twain should become one flesh, Gen. 2: 24, which he applies to the union of Christ and his church in Eph. 5: 31, 32.

How conspicuous this method of reasoning is, in the epistle to the Hebrews, need not be insisted on to any attentive reader. The whole comparison between Christ and Melchisedek, Heb. vii. is of a similar nature with those already mentioned. The temple and all its apparatus, and the holy place, which the high priest entered with his expiatory offerings of blood, are types and shadows of the temple, of the offering, and of the great high priest presenting it in the heavens, Heb. 8: 1—5. 9: 1—9. Indeed the strain of argumentation, throughout, is often *ad hominem* or *ex concessis*. The argument that Christ is a more exalted personage than the angels, than Moses, than the high priest; that Christ's priesthood, the temple in which he officiates with all its apparatus, the offering of blood which he makes, and his official duties as a priest, are all spiritual, heavenly, elevated above all the corresponding things in the Jewish dispensation, to which the Jew adhered with so strong an attachment, and by which he was tempted to make defection from his Christian profession, is peculiarly *ad hominem*. We who are not Jews, and who have never felt the power of their prejudices, need not, in order to produce in us a conviction of the importance of Christianity, to be addressed with comparisons drawn from ritual types, and from the analogy of such objects. But these were all familiar to the

Jew, and were not only attractive to him, but, in his view, of the highest importance. No one, indeed, can reasonably find fault, that the writer addresses the Jews *as such*; reasons with them *as such*; and makes use of those arguments, whether *ad hominem* or *ex concessis*, which he knew would produce the most powerful effect in persuading them to hold fast the truths of Christianity. There is nothing in this, which is inconsistent with the maxim of that apostle, who became "all things to all men;" with the Jews, demeaning himself and reasoning as a Jew, and in like manner with the Gentiles, in order that he might win both to Christianity.

But it is not my object, here, to defend the *manner* of argumentation employed in Paul's acknowledged epistles, and in the epistle to the Hebrews. I design merely to shew, (what cannot be denied), that the same method of reasoning from sentiments and objects presented by the Old Testament, is exhibited by both, and in a manner which cannot well escape the attention of the inquisitive reader.

I will only ask now, What other writers of the New Testament have exhibited the traits of composition, which I have noted under this head, in the same degree, or with the same frequency? Nay, I venture to affirm, that there is scarcely an approximation, in any of their writings, to those of Paul, either in regard to the frequency or the latitude of the usage in question.

But it may be said, "This only shews, that these other writers named, were not the authors of the epistle to the Hebrews; not that Paul wrote this epistle."

It seems to me, however, to go somewhat further. It proves that the characteristics peculiar to Paul's epistles and to the epistle to the Hebrews, were not the general or universal characteristics of writers of that age; and of course that either Paul, or one who had drunk in deeply of his doctrine and manner, must have written the epistle in question.

(3.) *The manner of Paul's reasoning, in respect to separating his premises from his conclusion, or his protasis from his epistasis, bears a striking resemblance to that which is found in the epistle to the Hebrews.*

The peculiarity I have in view, is the enthymeme or imperfect form of syllogism, and unfinished sentences and comparisons; which, it has been often observed, are characteristic of Paul's mode of writing. He states the major, or major and minor terms, of a syllogism; or the first parts of a sentence or comparison; and then leaving it in this unfinished state, he turns aside to illustrate or confirm some hint, which was suggested to his mind by what he had stated; or some train of thought is introduced, to which the natural association of ideas would lead; and after descending on this, he returns, and with, or without, repeating his proposition or sentence at first commenced, presents in full the conclusion or epitasis, which is required to complete it.

A striking example of this occurs in Rom. 5: 12—18. "Wherefore," says he "as by one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned, v. 12." The premises being thus stated, he turns aside to descant on the universality of sin, its pernicious consequences, and the salutary effects of the blessing which is proffered by Christ; and it is not until he reaches the 18th verse of the chapter, that the proposition which he had commenced is repeated, and the conclusion fully brought out, where it is thus stated, "Therefore as by one offence, condemnation came upon all men; so by the obedience of one, the blessing of justification unto life comes upon all men."

So in Rom. 2: 6, Paul says, "Who [God] will render to every man according to his works;" and after nine verses of explanatory matter, which was suggested by the mention of *rendering to every man according to his works*, he adds, at last, the remainder of the sentence which he had begun, viz. "in the day when the secret doings of men shall be judged by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel which I preach, Rom. 2: 16."

So in Eph. 3: 1, the apostle says, "For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles;" then leaving the sentence thus commenced, he proceeds on 12 verses, with thoughts suggested by the mention of his being a messenger to the Gentiles; and finally, in the 13th verse, he adds the conclu-

sion of the sentence commenced in the first, viz. "I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory."

In the same way, has the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews constructed some of his reasonings and sentences. In Heb. 4: 6, he says, "Seeing then it remains that some should enter into [the rest], and they to whom the good tidings were formerly proclaimed, did not enter in through unbelief—;" the sentence is then suspended, until the writer introduces another quotation from the Psalms, and reasons upon it, in order to prove that the rest in question could not have been such a rest as the land of Canaan proffered. After this, and in the 9th verse, we have the concluding part of the sentence or syllogism, viz. "there remaineth, then a rest, for the people of God." How entirely this coincides with the Pauline manner above exhibited, must strike the mind of every one who considers it.

So in Heb. 5: 6, the writer introduces the divine appointment of Christ as a priest after the order of Melchisedek, with a design to show that this was an appointment of the most *solemn* nature, and of a higher order than that of the Jewish priests. He then suspends the consideration of this topic, and introduces another, in vs. 7—9; after which he resumes the former topic. But no sooner does he do this, than he turns aside once more, in order to descant upon the difficulties which present themselves in the way of an ample discussion of it. These result from the very imperfect state of religious knowledge among those whom he addresses, 5: 11—14; the criminality and danger of which state he dwells upon at large, in chap. vi. intermixing threats and encouragements. It is not until we come to chap. 7: 1, that the subject of Melchisedek's priesthood is resumed; where it is treated of, at full length.

So in Heb. 9: 7, the writer says, that 'the Jewish high-priest, entered into the holy place, once in each year, with the blood of victims, in order to make atonement.' This is designed as one member of a comparison; but the other member follows only in 9: 12, after descanting on several matters suggested by what the writer had stated. There the antithesis is stated, viz. "Jesus the high priest of future blessings, entered the sanctuary



of the temple not made with hands, with his own blood, accomplishing eternal redemption, 9: 12.”

Such is the suspended connexion here, even if we adopt that method of interpretation which will make it as close as possible. But an attentive consideration of the whole preceding context, will perhaps render it probable to the attentive reader, that Heb. 9: 11 may be the antithesis of the latter part of 8: 4, and first part of 8: 5 ; where the *ὑπόδειγμα* and *σκιά τῶν ἐπουρανίων*, are in contrast with the *μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν* and the *μειζόνος καὶ τελειότερας σκηνῆς, οὗ χειροποιήτου*, of 9: 11.

How much such suspensions resemble the manner of Paul, need not be again insisted on. Instances of this nature might easily be increased ; but no attentive critical reader can help observing them, as they abound in the epistle to the Hebrews.

The instances above produced may serve to shew, that, as to *form* and *method*, in regard either to general arrangement, or the deducing of arguments from the Old Testament, or the exhibition of a peculiar manner in the statement of these arguments, there is a striking similarity between the acknowledged writings of Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews.

To the method of argument which I have thus far employed, in order to shew the probability that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, some objections have been, and may be raised.

It may be asked, ‘ Did not Paul’s hearers, disciples, and intimate friends, who travelled with him, daily conversed with him, and for years heard his instructions, cherish the same views of doctrine that he did ? And in writing the epistle to the Hebrews, might not an attentive hearer of Paul, and a reader of his epistles, exhibit the same sentiments ? And further ; if the same general manner, in which the contents of his epistles are arranged, or the contents of some of them, be found in the epistle to the Hebrews ; or if the particular manner in which he quotes or employs passages of the Jewish Scriptures, or interprets them ; or if even his method of stating arguments, and employing imperfect syllogisms or sentences, be found in this epistle ; still, may not some favourite disciple of his, some de-

voted follower and successful imitator of his manner, be naturally supposed to have derived all this from hearing him and reading his letters? And how then, can arguments of this nature *prove*, that Paul wrote the epistle in question?

Prove it, in the way of demonstration, they certainly cannot; nor is this the purpose for which they are adduced. But of this, more hereafter. At present, I merely observe, that the force of these objections is very much diminished, if in comparing the epistle to the Hebrews with the writings of Paul, it shall appear, that not the strain of sentiment only; not merely the general arrangement of the contents of the epistle, or the particular manner of it in respect to various ways of reasoning, or constructing syllogisms and sentences; but even the *idiomatical* and *distinctive style* and *diction* itself of Paul abound in it. These, none but a writer that was a mere copyist or plagiarist could exhibit. But such a writer is one of the last men, who can be justly suspected of having composed an epistle, like that to the Hebrews.

These suggestions naturally lead us, in the next place, to a comparison, in respect to *phraseology* and *words*, between the acknowledged writings of Paul, and the epistle to the Hebrews.

X

§ 23. *Comparison of the phraseology and diction of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epistles of Paul.*

I. The similarity of phraseology and diction, where the same words, or synonymous ones, are employed; or where the shade of thought or representation is peculiar and homogeneous, although the language may be somewhat diverse.

Heb. 1: 2. Δι' οὗ [Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας [θεός] ἐποίησε.

Eph. 3: 9, Τῷ [θεῷ] τὰ πάντα κτίσασθαι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Heb. 1: 3, Ὃς ὄν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.

Col. 1: 15, Ὃς ἔστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου.

Phil. 2: 6, Ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.

2 Cor. 4: 4, Ὃς ἔστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Heb. 1: 3, *Φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.*

Col. 1: 17, *τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνεστήκε.*

Heb. 1: 5, *Τίός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.*

Acts 13: 33, *Τίός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε;* used here by Paul, and applied in both passages, (but no where else in the New Testament), to Christ.

Heb. 1: 4, *Τοσοῦτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσω διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα.*

Eph. 1: 21, *ὑπεράνω . . . . παντός ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μελλόντι.*

Phil. 2: 9, *Ὁ θεὸς . . . . ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομαζόμενον ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι ἰησοῦ πάντων γόνυ κάμψη ἐπουρανίων κ.τ.λ.*

Heb. 1: 6, *Τὸν πρωτότοκον . . . .*

Rom. 8: 29, *Εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν τὸν πρωτότοκον.*

Col. 1: 15, *Πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.* V. 18, *Πρωτότοκος.* This appellation is applied to Christ no where else, excepting in Rev. 1: 5.

Heb. 2: 2, *Ὁ δὲ ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος.*

Gal. 3: 19, *Ὁ νόμος . . . διαταγὴς δὲ ἀγγέλων.* Comp. Acts 7: 53.

Here is the same sentiment, *λόγος* and *νόμος* being synonymes; as, for substance, *λαληθεὶς* and *διαταγὴς* are. However, Stephen once uses a similar expression, Acts 7: 53.

Heb. 2: 4, *Σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι, καὶ ποικίλοις δυνάμεσι, καὶ πνεύματος ἀγίου μερισμοῖς.*

1 Cor. 12: 4, *Μιαροῦσες δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα.*

1 Cor. 12: 11, *Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνέργει τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται.*

Rom. 12: 6, *Ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα . . .* all spoken of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and characterized by the same shade of thought, viz. the *various* or *different gifts* of this nature, distributed by him.

Heb. 2: 8, *Πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.*

1 Cor. 15: 27, *Πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.*

Eph. 1: 22, *καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.*

Phil. 3: 21, Ὑποτάξαι ἐναντιῶν τὰ πάντα . . . . phraseology applied to designate the sovereignty conferred upon Christ, and found only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. 2: 10, Δι' ὧν τὰ πάντα, καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα.

Rom. 11: 36, Ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα.

Col. 1: 16, Ἐκ τῶν πάντων δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν.

1 Cor. 8: 6, Εἰς θεὸς . . . ἕξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς Κύριος . . . δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα . . . a method of expression, employed to designate God as the author of all things, and also the lord and possessor of them, which is appropriate to Paul, and to our epistle.

Heb. 2: 14, Ἴνα . . . καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸν διάβολον.

2 Tim. 1: 10, Καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον. Καταργέω, employed in the sense of *abolishing, rendering null*, is exclusively Pauline. No other writer of the New Testament employs it at all, except Luke; and he but once, and then in quite a different sense from that attached to it by Paul, Luke 13: 7.

Heb. 2: 16, Σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, to designate Christians.

Gal. 3: 29, Ἐὰν δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστιοὺ. ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ.

Gal. 3: 7, Οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ.

Rom. 4: 16, Ἀβραάμ, ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν.

The appellation, *seed* or *sons of Abraham*, applied to designate Christians, is found only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. 3: 1, Κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου.

Phil. 3: 14, Τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ.

Rom. 11: 29, Ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ. The phrase *heavenly* or *divine calling*, applied to designate the proffered mercies of the gospel, is limited to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. 4: 12, Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ . . . καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον.

Eph. 6: 17, Τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστι ῥῆμα θεοῦ. The comparison of the word of God to a sword, is found only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. 5: 3, *Καίπερ ὡν υἱὸς, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν.*

Phil. 2: 3, *Ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος, μέχρι θανάτου.* The idea of *obedience* in the *humiliation and sufferings* of Christ, constitutes the speciality and the similitude of these two passages.

Heb. 5: 13, *Νήπιος γὰρ ἐστὶ, i. e. a child in religion, comparatively ignorant, uninformd.*

1 Cor. 3: 1, *Ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ,* in the same sense.

Eph. 4: 14, *ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι,* in the same.

Rom. 2: 20, *Διδάσκων νηπίων,* in the same.

Gal. 4: 3, *Ὅτε ἡμεν νήπιοι,* in the same. This phraseology is limited to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. 5: 14, *Τελείων δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή.*

1 Cor. 14: 20, *Ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶ τέλειοι γίνεσθε.* The word *τέλειοι* is here the antithesis of *νήπιοι*, and means *well instructed, mature.* In this sense, it is employed only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. 6: 1, *Τελειότητα, an advanced, mature state, i. e. of Christian knowledge.*

Col. 3: 14, *Σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, the bond or cement of a matured Christian state.* The word *τελειότης*, in such a sense, is limited to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. 6: 3, *Ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπη ὁ θεός.*

1 Cor. 16: 7, *Ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος ἐπιτρέπη* . . . a phrase no where else employed.

Heb. 6: 10, *Τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς ἐνδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἀγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες.*

2 Cor. 8: 24, *Τὴν οὖν ἐνδειξιν τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν . . . εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐνδείξασθε.* The similarity consists in employing *ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ἀγάπην* in both cases, constructed with *εἰς* before the object that follows.

Heb. 8: 5, *Οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων.*

Heb. 10: 1, *Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων.*

Col. 2: 17, *Ἄ ἐστι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων . . . language respecting*

the figurative nature of the Jewish dispensation, which is appropriate to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. 8: 6, *Κρείτινός ἐστι διαθήκης μεσίτης.*

1 Tim. 2: 5, *Εἰς μεσίτης . . . Χριστός Ἰησοῦς.*

Gal. 3: 19, 20, *Ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. Ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστι*

The word *mediator*, applied to designate Christ, or Moses, is appropriate to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. 8: 10, *Καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν.*

2 Cor. 6: 16. *Καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεός, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι λαός.*

Both passages are quoted from the Old Testament. The resemblance consists, in the quotation and application of the same passage in both places, and in the same manner.

Heb. 8: 10, *Καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς.*

Rom. 2: 15, *Τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτόν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.*

2 Cor. 3: 3, *Ἐγγραμμένη . . . ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίας σαρκίνοις.*

The passage in Hebrews is a quotation. But the other passages serve to show, that such a phraseology was familiar to Paul, and that he probably derived it from the Old Testament passage, quoted in Heb. 8: 10.

Heb. 9: 15, *Θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων.*

Rom. 3: 25, *Διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρόσεως . . . εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων.*

In these two passages the peculiar idea is expressed, that the efficacy of Christ's atoning blood extends back to past ages; an idea no where else brought to view in the same manner.

Heb. 10: 19, *Ἔχοντες . . . παρόρησιαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ.*

Rom. 5: 2, *Δι' οὗ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχίκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην.*

Eph. 2: 18, *Δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν . . . πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.*

Eph. 3: 12, *Ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παρόρησιαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐν πεποιθήσει.*

The idea of *access* to God, or *παρόρησία*, *bold, free access*, or *liberty of address*, is designated in this manner only by Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. 10: 28, 'Επὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάστιγιν ἀποθνήσκει.

2 Cor. 13: 1, 'Επὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα.

1 Tim. 5: 19, 'Επὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων. Such an expression is found elsewhere, only in the words of Christ, Matt. 18: 16.

Heb. 10: 30, 'Εμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω.

Rom. 12: 19, 'Εμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω.

The similarity consists in quoting the same passage, and applying it to show that punishment is the awful prerogative of the Deity, and that he will inflict it.

Heb. 10: 32, "Αθλήσιν . . . τῶν παθημάτων.

Phil. 1: 30, Τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες, οἷον εἶδετε ἐν ἐμοί.

Col. 2: 1, 'Ηλικὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν.

1 Thess. 2: 2, Αὐλήσαι . . . τό εὐαγγέλιον . . . ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι.

The phrase *contest*, in respect to afflictions, is peculiar to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. 10: 33, 'Ονειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσι θεατροιζόμενοι.

1 Cor. 4: 9, Θεάτρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ, κ. τ. λ. . . language peculiar to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. 10: 33, Κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφόμενων γεννηθέντες, *participating*, i. e. *sympathising* with the afflicted.

Phil. 4. 14, Σιγκαινωνήσανιές μου τῇ θλίψει, *sympathising in my affliction*. The same figurative expression stands in both passages.

Heb. 10: 38, 'Ο δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Rom. 1: 17, 'Ο δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Gal. 3: 11, "Οτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

The passage is a quotation. But the application and use of it, appear to be exclusively Pauline.

Heb. 12: 1, Τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα.

1 Cor. 9: 24, Οὕτω τρέχετε ἵνα καταλάβητε.

Phil. 3: 14, Τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω.

The resemblance here is, that Christian efforts are, in each passage, compared to *a race*; a comparison found only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. 13: 18, *Πεποιθάμεν γάρ, ὅτι καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν.*

Acts 23: 1, Paul says, *Ἐγὼ πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ πεπολίτευμαι* . . . . a manner of speaking found no where else.

Heb. 13: 20, *Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος.*

Rom. 15: 33, *Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος.* Also in Rom. 16: 20. 1 Cor. 14: 33. 2 Cor. 13: 11. Phil. 4: 9. 1 Thess. 5: 23; an expression used by no other writer of the New Testament.

Heb. 13: 18, *Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν.*

1 Thess. 5: 25, *Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν.*

Natural as this may appear, at the close of a letter, it is peculiar to Paul and to our epistle.

To the instances of phraseology thus collected, may be added the greeting and benediction at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, which is altogether Pauline.

II. Words which are found, among the New Testament writers, only in Paul and in our epistle; or, if found elsewhere, are used in a sense different from that in which they are here employed.

*Ἀγών*, in the sense of *Christian effort*, either in performing duties, or bearing trials, Heb. 12: 1. 1 Tim. 6: 12. 2 Tim. 4: 7.

*Ἀδελφοί*, *brethren of Christ*, considered in respect to his human nature, Heb. 2: 12, 17. Rom. 8: 29.

*Ἀδόκιμος*, *inept, unfit*, Heb. 6: 8. Tit 1: 16.

*Ἀιδώς*, *reverence, modesty*, Heb. 12: 28. 1 Tim. 2: 9.

*Ἀιρέομαι*, *to choose*, Heb. 11: 25. 2 Thess. 2: 13. Phil. 1: 22.

*Ἄκακος*, *innocent*, Heb. 7: 26. Rom. 16: 18.

*Ἀσθενεία*, *sin, sinful infirmity*, Heb. 5: 2. Rom. 5: 6.

*Διαθήκη*, *will, testament*, Heb. 9: 16. Gal. 3: 15. It is doubtful, however, whether *διαθήκη* has the sense of *testament*, in the latter passage.

*Ἐλπὶς προκεκειμένη*, *proffered Christian happiness*, Heb. 6: 18. Col. 1: 5.

*Ἐκλύω*, *to be despondent*, Heb. 12: 3. Gal. 6: 9.



Ἐνδυναμῶ, *to give strength ; (passively) to receive strength*, Heb. 11: 34. 2 Tim. 4: 17. 1 Tim. 1: 12.

Καταργεῖν, *to annul, abolish, abrogate*, Heb. 2: 14. Rom. 3: 3, 31. 6: 6. 1 Cor. 1: 28. Gal. 5: 11, and elsewhere often in Paul's epistles.

Καύχημα, *glorying, rejoicing*, Heb. 3: 6. Rom. 4: 2. 1 Cor. 9: 15.

Κληρόνομος, *lord, possessor*, applied to Christ, Heb. 1: 2. Rom. 8: 17.

Αυτρεύειν, (*δουλεύειν*, a synonyme) *θεῶ ζῶντι*, Heb. 9: 14. 1 Thess. 1: 9.

Μὴ (οὐ) βλεπόμενα, *the invisible objects of the future world*, Heb. 11: 1. 2 Cor. 4: 18.

Ὁμολογία, *religion, religious, or Christian profession*, Heb. 3: 1. 4: 14. 10: 23. 2 Cor. 9: 13.

Ὁνομα, *majesty, or dignity*, Heb. 1: 4. Phil. 2: 9, 10. Eph. 1: 21.

But although this sense of ὄνομα in Heb. 1: 4, is adopted by some eminent critics, still it is more probable that it has the sense of *appellation* ; see Heb. 1: 5, seq.

Οὐ κτίσις, *nothing*, Heb. 4: 13. Rom. 8: 39.

Τελειῶ, *to consummate in happiness, to bestow the reward consequent on finishing a victorious course*, Heb. 2: 10. 7: 28. 10: 14. Phil. 3: 12.

Υπόστασις, *confidence*, Heb. 3: 14. 11: 1. 2 Cor. 9: 4. 11: 17.

Ἰηρουσαλήμ ἐπουράνιος, *the abode of the blessed*, Heb. 12: 22 ; comp. Ἰηρουσαλήμ ἄνω, Gal. 4: 26, in the like sense.

### III. Peculiarity of *grammatical construction*, in regard to the use of the passive verb, instead of the active.

Thus in Heb. 7: 11, we find the phrase, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο, *for the people under it [the Levitical priesthood] received the law* ; where the nominative case of the person who is the *object* (not the *subject*) in the sentence, is joined with the passive of the verb ; and this mode of construction is employed, instead of the *active* voice of the same verb, followed by the *dative* of the person who is the *object* ; e. g. νενομοθέτητο λαῷ.

The like construction is found in Paul's acknowledged writings. E. g. Rom. 3: 2, ὅτι [αὐτοὶ] ἐπισιεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, *they were entrusted with the oracles of God*, instead of saying, *the oracles of God were entrusted to them*. Rom. 6: 17—εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδασχῆς, *into which model of doctrine ye have been delivered*, instead

of, *which form or model of doctrine was delivered to you.* 1 Tim. 1: 11, ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγώ, *with which I was entrusted,* instead of, *which was entrusted to me,* ὃ ἐπιστεύθη μοι.

This is a minuteness of grammatical construction, which a copyist of Paul would not be likely either to notice or to imitate. It affords, therefore, the more striking evidence, that all proceeded from the same hand.

Finally, Paul frequently employs an adjective of the neuter gender, in order to designate *generic quality*, instead of using a synonymous noun; e. g. τὸ γνωσιόν, Rom. 1: 19; τὸ χρησιόν, Rom. 2: 4; τὸ δυνατόν, Rom. 9: 22; τὸ ἀδύνατον, Rom. 7: 3; τὸ ἀσθενές, 1 Cor. 1: 25. Compare τὸ ἀμειάθετον, Heb. 6: 17; τὸ φανταζόμενον, Heb. 12: 21; τὸ κωλόν, 12: 13.

§ 24. *Remarks on the comparisons made in the preceding sections.*

In the first place, without any hesitation, I concede thus much to those critics, who make light of the evidence drawn from such a comparison as has now been made, viz. that no evidence of this nature, can ever afford what is equivalent to a *demonstration* of the fact, for the support of which it is adduced. But then, *demonstration* is what such a case neither admits nor demands. If the writer's name were affixed to the epistle, it would not amount to proof of this kind; for might it not have been put there by another person, in order to answer some designs of his own? Nay, unless witnesses have given us testimony, who themselves saw Paul write the epistle, the proof is not of the highest kind that is *possible*; nor even then, would their testimony establish the fact, unless we could be well assured of their credibility. By such a criterion, however, the genuineness of no writing, ancient or modern, can be examined. It is *generally* enough for us, that an author's name is affixed to a writing. *Prima facie*, it is evidence that it belongs to him; and it must be regarded as *sufficient* evidence, until it is contradicted either expressly, or by implication.

Let us suppose now, that, after an author has published many pieces, and his style and sentiments have become well known.

he publishes a composition of any kind, without affixing his name to it; can there be no adequate, no *satisfactory* evidence, that it belongs to him?

This is the very question before us. I grant that *similarity*, or even *sameness* of *sentiment*, in different pieces, does not certainly prove identity of authorship; for the friends, or imitators, or disciples of any distinguished man, may imbibe the same sentiments which he inculcates, and exhibit them in similar words and phrases. I grant that the primitive teachers of Christianity were agreed, and must have been agreed, (supposing that they were under divine guidance), as to the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. But in respect to the *mode of representing* them; in regard to the style, and diction, and urgency with which particular views of doctrine are insisted on; what can be more various and diverse than the epistles of Paul, and James, and Peter, and John?

The reply to this, by critics who entertain sentiments different from those which I have espoused, is, that 'the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews was an intimate friend, or a studious imitator of Paul; a man of talents, who with unqualified admiration of the apostle's sentiments, mode of reasoning, and even choice of words, closely imitated him in all these particulars. Hence the similarity, between the writings of Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews.'

The *possibility* of this cannot be denied. Designed imitation has, in a few instances, been so successful as to deceive, at least for a while, the most sharp sighted critics. Witness the imitation of Shakspeare which a few years ago was palmed upon the English public, as the work of that distinguished poet himself. Witness also the well known and long controverted fact, in respect to the pieces ascribed to Ossian, which are now known to be a forgery. But after all, such attempts have very *seldom* been successful, even where the most strenuous efforts have been made at close imitation; and these, with all the advantages which a modern education could afford. How few, for example, of the multitudes, who have aimed at copying the style of Addison or Johnson, with the greatest degree of exactness,

have succeeded even in any tolerable measure; and none in such a way, that they are not easily distinguished from the models which they designed to imitate.

Just so it was, in the primitive age of the church. The Christian world was filled with gospels and epistles, ascribed to Paul, and Peter, and other apostles and disciples. Yet no one of these succeeded, in gaining any considerable credit among the churches; and what little was ever gained by any of them, proved to be temporary, and of very small influence. This was not owing to want of exertion; for strenuous efforts were made by writers to imitate the apostolic manner of writing, so as to gain credit for their supposititious pieces. But all of them failed. Indeed, nothing can be more egregious, or striking, than the failure. A comparison of any of the *apocryphal* writings of the New Testament, with the *genuine* writings of the same, shews a difference heaven-wide between them, which the most undistinguishing intellect can hardly fail to discern.

If then the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews was an imitator, a designed and close imitator, of the apostle Paul, he has succeeded, in such a way as no other writer of those times or any succeeding ones ever did. He has produced a composition, the sentiments of which in their shade, and colouring, and proportion, (so far as his *subjects* are common with those in the acknowledged epistles of Paul), are altogether Pauline. Nay, he has preserved not only the order of writing which Paul adopts, but his mode of reasoning, his phraseology, and even his choice of peculiar words, or words used in a sense peculiar to the apostle. The imitation goes so far, it extends to so many particulars, important and unimportant, that, if our epistle was not written by Paul, it must have been an imitation of him which was the effect of settled design, and was accomplished only by the most strenuous effort.

But here, while I acknowledge the *possibility* of such an imitation, I must from thorough conviction say, that the *probability* of it does seem to be very small. With Origen, I must, after often repeated study of this epistle, say, *The sentiments are wonderful, and in no way behind those of the acknowledged writings of*

*the aposiles, τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δευτέρα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων*, Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VI. 25. I cannot find any higher intensity of mind; any more exalted conceptions of the true nature of Christianity, as a *spiritual* religion; any higher views of God and Christ, or of the Christian's privileges and his obligations to believe in, love, and obey the Saviour; any more noble excitements to pursue the Christian course, unawed by the threats and unallured by the temptations of the world; or any so awful representations of the fearful consequences of unbelief and of defection from Christianity. The man, who wrote this epistle, has no marks of a plagiarist, or of an imitator, about him. Nothing can be more free and original than his thoughts, reasonings, and mode of expressing them. It is most evident, that they flow directly and warm from the heart. They are "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn." Where, in all the ancient world, did ever a plagiarist or an imitator write in this manner? A man who could form such conceptions in his mind, who could reason, and exhort in such an impressive and awful manner; has he any need of imitating—even Paul himself? No; it may be said of him, (what Paul on another occasion said of himself in comparison with his brethren), that "he was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the apostles."

Then how could such a man be concealed, in the first ages of the church, when the memory of those who were very distinguished, has been preserved so distinct, and with so much care and reverence, by ecclesiastical tradition? Men, who can write in this manner, cannot remain concealed any where. And the writer of such an epistle, it would seem, must have acted a part not less conspicuous than that of the great apostle of the Gentiles himself.

But antiquity, we are told, has attributed this epistle to distinguished men in the early church; to Clement of Rome, to Luke, or to Barnabas; each of whom is known to have been the warm friend and admirer of Paul.

I know this has been often alleged. But, fortunately, there are extant writings of each of these persons, with which our epistle may

be compared; and which serve to shew how little foundation there is for such an opinion. But of this more hereafter. I merely say, at present, that the great body of critics, for some time past, have agreed in rejecting the opinion, which ascribes our epistle to either of the authors just mentioned.

Who then did write it, if Paul did not? And what is to be gained, by endeavouring to shew the *possibility* that some other person wrote it, when so many circumstances unite in favour of the general voice of the primitive ages, that this apostle was the author? That the church, during the first century after the apostolic age, ascribed it to some one of the apostles, is clear from the fact, that it was inserted among the canonical books of the churches in the East and the West; that it was comprised in the *Peshito*; in the old Latin version; and was certainly admitted by the Alexandrine and Palestine churches. Now what apostle did write it, if Paul did not? Surely neither John, nor Peter, nor James, nor Jude. The difference of style is too striking, between their letters and this, to admit of such a supposition. But what other apostle, except Paul, was ever distinguished in the ancient church as a writer? None; and the conclusion, therefore, seems to be altogether a probable one, that he was the writer. Why should all the circumstances which speak for him, be construed as relating to some unknown writer? Are the sentiments unworthy of him? Are they opposed to what he has inculcated? Do they differ from what he has taught? Neither. Why not then admit the *probability* that he was the author? Nay, why not admit that the probability is as great as the nature of the case, (the epistle being anonymous), could be expected to afford? Why should there be any more objection to Paul as the author of this epistle, than to any other man?

My own conviction, (if I may be permitted to express it), is as clear in respect to this point, as from its nature I could expect it to be. I began the examination of the subject unbiassed, if I was ever unbiassed in the examination of any question; and the evidence before me has led me to such a *result*.

But the arguments, which are urged against the opinion that I have now endeavoured to defend remain to be examined. They

must not be passed over in silence, nor any of them be kept out of sight, to which importance can reasonably be attached.

§ 25. *Objections.*

The objections made to the opinion, that Paul was the author of our epistle, are numerous. All the hints which ancient writers have given, by way of objection, have been brought forward, of late, and urged with great zeal and ability. Arguments internal and external, of every kind, have been insisted on. Indeed, the attack upon the Pauline origin of our epistle has been so warmly and powerfully made, by the last and present generation of critics on the continent of Europe, that most who are engaged in the study of sacred literature, seem inclined to think that the contest is over, and that victory has been won. So much, at least, must be conceded, viz. that those who admit the Pauline origin of this epistle, must make more strenuous efforts than they have yet made, in order to defend their opinion, and to satisfy objectors. To do this, is indeed a most laborious, and in many cases exceedingly repulsive task; for of such a nature are many of the objections, thrown out at random, and asserted with confidence, that an attack which cost but a few moment's effort on the part of the assailant, costs days and weeks of labour, on the part of him who makes defence.

The question, however, is too important to be slightly treated. Nor will it suffice for those who defend the Pauline origin of our epistle, merely to select a few specimens of argument on the part of their opponents, and, shewing the insufficiency or inaccuracy of these, make their appeal to the reader's sympathies, assuring him, that the rest of the arguments employed by their opponents, is of a similar nature. There are readers, (and such are the men whose opinion on subjects of this nature is most to be valued), who will not be satisfied with cursory, hasty, half-performed examination; and who, when you show them that one or more of an opponent's arguments is unsound, will not believe it to follow, of course, that all of them must be so. Above all, one must expect, that many doubters of the genuineness of our

epistle, will not be satisfied with having only one side of the question presented. It is reasonable that they should not; and if the objections, which have weight in their minds, cannot be as satisfactorily answered, as from the nature of the case might be justly expected, then let them have so much weight as is properly due to them.

It is but fair to warn the reader, that in entering on this part of our subject, his patience will be tried, by the length and minuteness of the examination. Perhaps those only, who fully know the present state of critical effort and opinion with respect to the literature of our epistle, will be able to find an adequate apology for such particularity as the sequel exhibits. But such probably will feel, that the time has come, when objections must either be *fully* and *fairly* met, or those who defend the Pauline origin of our epistle must consent to give up their opinion, if they would preserve the character of candour. The present leaning of criticism is strongly against this origin; and it is high time that the subject should receive an ample discussion.

Whether the question at issue has been deeply, fundamentally, and patiently examined, by the principal writers who have given a tone to the present voice of critics, I will not venture either to affirm or to deny. I shall leave it to the reader, when he shall have gone through with an examination of these writers, to speak his own feelings.

### § 26. *Objections by Bertholdt considered.*

Bertholdt has collected and embodied all the objections made by previous writers, which are worthy of particular consideration, in his Introduction to the books of the Old and New Testament. To these he has added some, which apparently were originated by himself. I shall briefly state his objections; subjoining to each, as I proceed, such remarks as the nature of the case may seem to demand.

(1.) 'It is a suspicious circumstance, and against the opinion that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, that he has not subscribed his name; since he says in 2 Thess. 3: 17, that it was



his practice to do this in order to shew that letters, purporting to be his, might thus be certainly known as being genuine.'

The reply to this is obvious. After Paul had written his first epistle to the Thessalonian church, in which he had mentioned the *second coming* of Christ, it appears that some one had written another letter, counterfeiting his name, in which *the day of the Lord* had been represented as *very near*. On this account, Paul says, in his second letter to the same church, "Be not agitated by any message, or by any epistle as from me, in respect to the day of the Lord, as being already at hand, 2: 2." And then, to avoid the effects of any misrepresentation of this nature, for the future, he says at the close of the letter, 3: 17, "This salutation from me, Paul, by my own hand. This is the proof [viz. of the genuineness of my letter], in every epistle [i. e. to your church]; so I write."

Let it now be noted, that the epistles to the Thessalonians, were the first, in regard to time, which Paul wrote to any church; at least, the first that are now extant. Under circumstances like these, when letters to the Thessalonians had been forged in his name, can the assurance that he subscribes all his letters to them with his own hand, be taken as a proof, that, in all his future life, he should never address an *anonymous* letter to any church, in any circumstances?

(2.) 'No good reason can be given why Paul should conceal his name. Does he not intimate, at the close of the letter, that he is yet in prison, but expects soon to be set at liberty? Does he not ask their prayers that he may be speedily restored? And does he not promise them a visit, in company with Timothy, if his return be speedy? Why should Paul attempt to conceal himself, when he has developed circumstances which evidently imply that he was not concealed, and that he did not desire to be so?'

But if this objection be of any validity, it is just as valid in respect to any other person, as to the writer of this letter. Why should any other writer attempt to conceal himself, when most clearly the tenor of the letter implies, that he must be known to those whom he immediately addresses? If there be any incon-

1147  
 1148  
 1149  
 1150  
 1151  
 1152  
 1153  
 1154  
 1155  
 1156  
 1157  
 1158  
 1159  
 1160  
 1161  
 1162  
 1163  
 1164  
 1165  
 1166  
 1167  
 1168  
 1169  
 1170  
 1171  
 1172  
 1173  
 1174  
 1175  
 1176  
 1177  
 1178  
 1179  
 1180  
 1181  
 1182  
 1183  
 1184  
 1185  
 1186  
 1187  
 1188  
 1189  
 1190  
 1191  
 1192  
 1193  
 1194  
 1195  
 1196  
 1197  
 1198  
 1199  
 1200

gruity here, it applies just as much to any other writer, as to Paul.

But is there no good reason imaginable, why Paul should have withheld his name? If he designed the epistle to be a *circumlocution* among the Jews generally, (which from the nature of the discussion, comprising topics so interesting to them all, I am altogether inclined to believe was the case), then might he not, as a measure of prudence, omit prefixing or subscribing his name directly, lest the prejudices of those Christians who were zealots for the law might be excited, on the *first* inspection of his epistle? *Ultimately*, he might be, and must be known, if the letter was traced back to the church to whom it was first sent, and the inquiries made respecting it, which the circumstances mentioned at the close of it would naturally suggest. To this the writer would probably feel no objection; trusting that the arguments suggested in it might disarm prejudiced readers, before they came to the certain knowledge of the author. Is it an unknown, unheard of case, that men should write letters, anonymously at first, but afterwards avow them? Or that they should write letters anonymous, but so circumstanced, and designedly so circumstanced, that inquiry might ultimately lead to a knowledge of the author?

Granting, however, that neither the reason of Clement of Alexandria, nor of Eusebius, nor of Jerome, nor the reason now given, for the apostle's withholding his name, is satisfactory; still is there no possibility that an adequate reason may have existed, for the letter being sent without the subscription of the writer's name, of which reason we are ignorant? Let it be whoever it may, that wrote the letter, does not the same difficulty, in every case, attend the explanation of its being *anonymous*? I can see no difference; unless we assume the position, that the writer meant it should be attributed to an apostle, and therefore concealed his own name. Such a writer, we cannot with any probability suppose the author of our epistle to have been. All—all is sincerity, fervent benevolence, ingenuous and openhearted dealing, throughout the whole.

Besides, is the case in hand one that has no parallel? Certainly not. The first epistle of John is altogether destitute of the

author's name, or of any internal marks that will lead us to know him, except what are contained in the style itself. Why should it be more wonderful, that *Paul* should write an anonymous letter, than that *John* should do it?

(3.) 'The Jews of Palestine had a great antipathy to Paul, and always persecuted him, when he came among them. How can it be supposed, that he should have addressed to them a letter, with the expectation that it would be read and regarded by them?'

That some of the zealots for the law, in Judea, were strongly opposed to Paul, is sufficiently evident from the history of his visits to Jerusalem. But, that the apostles and teachers there were his warm and decided friends, is equally evident, from the same source. Moreover, that there were private Christians there, who cherished a very friendly feeling toward him, is evident from Acts 21: 17, where, on his last visit there, *the brethren* (*οἱ ἀδελφοί*) are said to have received him gladly. The persecution, which ensued at this time, was first excited, as the historian expressly states, by Jews from Asia Minor, 21: 27. But it is unnecessary to dwell on this. At Ptolemais, 21: 7, and at Cesarea, 21: 8 seq. he had warm friends; and at the latter place, he abode two whole years as a prisoner, before his removal to Rome. Were there no friends of his then, in *Palestine*, among whom he could hope to find a listening ear? No Christians, on whom he could hope that his arguments would make an impression? And after all, did he ever cease to speak to the Jews, to admonish them, to dispute with them, in order to vindicate the religion which he had embraced, because they were prejudiced against him? How unlike himself, then, does the objection which we are considering represent Paul to be! He did not *confer with flesh and blood*; he believed that the armour in which he was clad, was "mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strong holds."

(4.) 'But there is internal evidence, from the style of the epistle to the Hebrews, and from circumstances mentioned in it, which render it impossible to believe that Paul was the author of it.'

This objection is a very ancient one. It was felt, as we have seen, by Clement of Alexandria; deeper still, by Origen; and adverted to by Eusebius, and other fathers of the church. It would seem, that there must be some real foundation for an objection, so long, so often, and confidently urged. Late critics have attributed an irresistible power to it. Eichhorn and Bertholdt maintain, that it lies so upon the very face of the whole epistle, that every reader must be impressed with it. So strong, indeed, are their impressions with respect to it, that they seem to require no other argument, in order to satisfy them that Paul could not have written the epistle to the Hebrews.

That there are cases, where the general character of the style of one piece, is so plainly different from another, as to leave no doubt on the mind of a discerning reader that both did not, nay even could not, come from the same pen, certainly cannot be called in question. Who could ever attribute the epistles of John, to Paul, or to Peter, or to James? But, that there are other cases, where the characteristic marks are not so discernible, and about which there may be a great difference of feeling in respect to the style, is well known. For example; the book of Deuteronomy is ascribed by one set of critics, of high acquisitions and refined taste, of great acuteness and discriminating judgment, to Moses as the author, because it betrays every where, as they think, the most indubitable marks of his style and spirit. Another class of critics, equally eminent for literary acquisition and discrimination, confidently draw the conclusion, that Moses could not have been the author, from the feeling which they have, on reading it, that it is composed in a manner totally diverse from the style and spirit of Moses.

Just such is the case, in regard to the speech of Elihu in the book of Job. One party reject it as spurious, because their *critical taste* leads them to do so; and another hold it to be genuine, for the like reason.

Isaiah, too, has met with the same fate. The last 26 chapters are now familiarly called Pseudo-Isaiah, by one party of critics; while another strive to vindicate the whole book as genuine.

Each party is equally confident, and equally satisfied of the validity of their arguments. But what is the humble inquirer to do, in the midst of all these contests of taste and of opinion? How can he trust his *feelings* to decide, with confidence, in a case where the most acute and distinguishing critics differ, in respect to the judgment, that a critical tact should give? He cannot do it with safety. In what way, then, shall one who examines for himself, be able to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion? My answer in all such cases would be, MAKE THE ACTUAL COMPARISON; collate sentiment with sentiment, phrase with phrase, words with words. This is the kind of proof that is *palpable*, and is not left to the uncertain tenor of feeling, excited by mere insulated perusal; a feeling, which in cases where the composition read is in a *foreign* language, must be a very uncertain guide; and which even in our own vernacular language, not unfrequently misleads us.

Origen, as he avers, found, in the epistle to the Hebrews, the *thoughts* of Paul; but the *words*, he thinks, are better Greek (*ἑλληνικώτερα*) than the apostle wrote. He therefore resorts to the supposition, that a translator had given to it its present Greek costume, who had received the *sentiments* from the mouth of Paul. But Eichhorn does not limit the difference, between the style of this epistle and those of Paul, to the quality of the Greek. "The manner of it," says he, "is more tranquil and logical, than that in which Paul with his strong feelings could write. Every thing is arranged in the most exact order. The expression is well rounded, choice, and very clear in the representation which it makes. Paul is altogether different; he is unperiodical, involved, obscure, writes poor Greek, is given to rhapsody and aphorism, Einl. § 260." Bertholdt has repeated the same sentiment, in almost the same words, in his Introduction to this Epistle, § 646.

If I might be allowed to express my own feelings, after having for many years annually devoted myself to the explanation of this epistle, translated it with all the care which I could bestow upon it, and minutely weighed every expression and word in it, I should say, that nothing could be more unfortunately chosen, than the epithet, "*ruhig*," *equable, tranquil, void of excitement*, which

these distinguished critics have applied to its style. I appeal to every man's feelings who reads it, and ask, Are there, in the whole book of God, any warnings so awful as here, and expressed with such mighty energy? Are there any threats of punishment for unbelief, so tremendous and impassioned as those in this epistle?

Then, as to 'every thing being arranged in such exact order,' as they aver, 'conclusion following conclusion, all in the manner of a good rhetorician;' the instances above produced, and which might easily be increased, of enthymemes, and suspended construction, exactly in the manner of Paul, may help to judge of this. Moreover, let any one make the attempt to translate this epistle into his own vernacular language, and he will then see whether all is so *well rounded* and *perspicuous*, as these critics represent it to be. I find ellipsis as frequent here, as in Paul's acknowledged writings. Any good translation, that exhibits the supply of these ellipses, and marks them by the common mode in which they are printed, demonstrates this to the eye. Hebraism I find here, as well and as often as in Paul. In short, I cannot but feel, in reading the epistle to the Hebrews, that the writer has reached the very summit of eloquence, and energy, and vivid representation, in many passages of his composition; and I am constrained to make a similar acknowledgment, in respect to many passages of the known epistles of Paul. I cannot perceive any striking diversity in regard to these characteristics.

To what cause, now, can it be attributed, that feelings so very different, in respect to the character of the style, should arise in the minds of men, when they read the epistle in question? Two reasons for this, I apprehend, may be given. The first and principal one is, that the main topics of this epistle are so diverse from those generally treated of in the acknowledged epistles of Paul, that they required, of course and from necessity, a variety of words, phrases, and ideas, that either are not common, or are not at all to be found in his other epistles. This I regard as chiefly the ground of the judgment, which has so often been passed in respect to *dissimilarity* of style. The other is, that one comes to the reading of this epistle, with his feelings impressed by the

circumstance, that there is a want of direct evidence about the author; and consequently so tuned, as to be strongly agitated by any thing, which may seem to increase or diminish the probability that Paul was the author of it. That the doctrinal views, contained in this epistle, have made many willing to get rid of its canonical authority, if it could be done, is not by any means improbable. After all, however, in a question where there is such a difference of sentiment in regard to style, among those who are capable of judging, the appeal must be made, and can be made, only to *actual comparison*. Such an appeal I have endeavoured to make. To array mere *feeling* or *apprehension*, arising from the perusal of the epistle, against *actual comparison*, can never be to judge by making use of the best means of judging. Origen's authority, in this case, can not go far with any one who chooses to examine and decide for himself. Origen, with all his talents and learning, was far enough from being a Cicero or a Quintilian, in respect to taste and nice discernment of differences of style. He makes assertions equally confident, in other cases, that will not bear the test of examination; and assertions too, that have respect to the Greek language, his mother tongue. For example, he says that the want of the article before  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ , in John 1: 1, proves that the writer cannot have meant to designate the *supreme God* by this word. Now whether the supreme God be meant, or not, can never be determined by such a rule; for it is usual, in the Greek language, that the *predicate* of a proposition should be without the article, while the *subject* commonly has it. Moreover, in the very same chapter,  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  stands without the article, in more than one instance, incontrovertibly, for the supreme God; e. g. in vs. 6, 12, 13, 18. Whether Origen's opinion, then, about the style of the epistle to the Hebrews, is well founded or not, is a proper subject of *examination*. The result of comparison has shewn, that in respect to sentiment, phraseology, and diction, the epistle is filled with the peculiarities of Paul. I doubt whether any one of Paul's acknowledged epistles, compared with the others, will supply more, or more exact resemblances.

I know, indeed, that no critic can be argued out of feelings of this sort in respect to style. But he may reasonably be called

upon to state the ground of those feelings; specially so, when he asserts, with a confidence which is intended to influence others, that the style of the epistle to the Hebrews cannot be Paul's.

(5.) But Bertholdt has made the appeal to *fact*. He has produced words and expressions which, he says, 'are not Pauline, and which serve satisfactorily to shew, that Paul could not have written the epistle to the Hebrews.' I proceed to examine them.

(a) 'In Hebrews 13: 7, 17, 24, the word *ἡγούμενοι* is used for *teachers*; Paul *every where* employs the word *διδάσκαλοι* for this purpose, p. 2937.'

The allegation, that Paul *every where* uses the word *διδάσκαλοι* to designate *teachers* is far from being correct. He uses besides this, the words *προσβύτερος*, 1 Tim. 5: 1, 17, 19. Tit. 1: 5; *ἐπίσκοπος*, Acts 20: 28. Phil. 1: 1. 1 Tim. 3: 2. Tit. 1: 7; *ποιμήν*, Eph. 4: 11. Very natural for Paul, it must have been, to apply a variety of appellations to Christian ministers, which would correspond with those applied to religious teachers in the Jewish synagogues. These were *מִשְׁרֵטָה*, *pastor, leader, guide, prefect*; *מְדַבֵּר*, *leader, guide*; *רֹבֵד*, *ruler, prefect*; and *מְדַבֵּר*, *guide, director*. What could be more natural, then, than for Paul, when writing to Hebrews, to call the teachers in their churches *ἡγούμενοι*, which corresponds quite well with all of the above appellations, that they had been accustomed to give to their religious teachers? Besides, the argument of Bertholdt, if admitted, would prove too much. The same mode of reasoning must lead us to conclude, that those epistles, in which Christian teachers are called *ἐπίσκοποι*, cannot be reckoned as Paul's, because *διδάσκαλοι* is not used instead of *ἐπίσκοποι*. The same may be said, in respect to the use of the words *ποιμήν* and *προσβύτεροι*. The consequence would be, that several of Paul's now acknowledged epistles could not be ascribed to him. But who that knows the variety of appellations, employed to designate teachers in the Jewish synagogues, can attribute any critical weight to the fact, that such a variety of Greek terms is used, corresponding with the Hebrew appellations, that were familiar to those whom our author addressed? And of all these Greek names of pastors, certain-



ly, none better corresponds with the Hebrew ones, than the word *ἡγούμενοι*, employed in our epistle.

It may be added, too, that Paul employed a term here, not at all *unique*; for the same appellation is given to teachers, in Luke 22: 26. Acts 14: 12. 15: 22.

(b) 'In the epistle to the Hebrews, *κατέχειν βεβαίαν* is used for *holding fast*, Heb. 3: 6, 14; and *κατέχειν ἀκλινην*, in Heb. 10: 23; while Paul uses only *κατέχειν* simply, 1 Cor. 11: 2. 15. 2. 1 Thess. 5: 21.'

On examination, I find the verb *κατέχω*, in the sense of *holding fast*, *carefully retaining*, to be exclusively *Pauline*. This word, then, affords an argument, to establish a conclusion, the reverse of that for which it is adduced by Bertholdt. The addition of *βεβαίαν* or *ἀκλινην* is evidently for the purpose merely of *intensity*; just as we may join an adverb to a verb for this purpose, or we may refrain from the use of it, and still employ the same verb simply in the same sense. What could be more natural, now, than for the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews to employ words of intensity, while in the state of strongly excited feeling in which he wrote?

(c) 'In the epistle to the Hebrews, we find *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, 7: 3, and *εἰς τὸ παντελές*, 7: 25, used to designate the idea of *forever*; while Paul always uses *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*.'

Our author, also, employs *αἰών*, in the epistle to the Hebrews, no less than nine times in the like way; viz. 1: 8. 5: 6. 6: 20. 7: 17, 21, 24, 28. 13: 8, 21. Is it a matter of wonder, then, that he should sometimes employ other words for the same purpose, which were synonymous; specially, if those words belonged both to common and to Hebrew Greek? Such is the fact, in respect to both the words in question. *Διηνεκές* is used by Aelian, Var. Hist. I. 19; by Appian, Bell. Civ. I. p. 682; Heliod. Ethiop. I. p. 25. Lucian, V. H. I. 19; by Symmachus, translator of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, Ps. 48: 15. *Παντελές* is used by Aelian, VII. 2. XII. 20; by Josephus, Antiq. VI. 2, 3; and by Luke, 13: 11.

But whether the sense of the word *παντελές*, in Heb. 7: 25, is *forever*, may be doubted. Its etymology would lead to the

sense of *prorsus, omnino*, i. e. *entirely, altogether, thoroughly*; and so many critics have construed it. Such is clearly the meaning of *παντελῶς*, e. g. Jos. Antiq. IV. 6. 5. 2 Macc. 3: 12, 31. 7: 40; and so Bretschneider construes *εἰς τὸ παντελές*, in Heb. 7: 25, in his recent Lexicon.

But supposing it does mean *forever*, in the case before us; can the argument, derived from the employment of such synonymes with *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, as belong to common and to Hebrew Greek, be of any validity to show that Paul could not have written our epistle?

(d) ‘*Αἰῶνες*, in the sense of *universe*, is used only in the epistle to the Hebrews, 1: 2. 11: 3. Paul employs other terms to designate the same idea, such as *τὰ πάντα*, etc.’

Paul, in the phrase *τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων*, 1 Tim. 1: 17, has employed the word in the same sense, as it is used in the epistle to the Hebrews; and as the use of the word *αἰών*, in such a sense, is limited to Paul and to our epistle, so far as the New Testament is concerned, it would seem to prove the reverse of what Bertholdt has adduced it to establish.

(e) ‘The word *πίστις* is *always* used by Paul, in the *restricted* sense of *πίστις εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*; in the epistle to the Hebrews, it is employed in a much wider latitude.’

So Bertholdt, p. 2939; and to the same purpose, Eichhorn Einleit. p. 462. This objection has been repeated, greatly magnified, and dwelt upon, by Schulz, *Brief an die Hebr. ier.* p. 112 seq.; and by Seyffarth, *de Epist. ad Heb. indole*, § 33. These latter writers represent *πίστις*, when used by Paul, as always having reference to Christ or the Christian religion as such; whereas *πίστις*, in our epistle, relates, they aver, only to God or to things future, and means a firm confidence in the declarations of God respecting them; a sense in which, as they think, Paul never employs the word.

I have united the objections and views of these writers under one head, in order to save the repetition of this subject. It deserves an attentive consideration.

There can be no doubt, that Paul, in a multitude of cases, employs *πίστις* to designate belief in Christ as our Saviour and

Redeemer. He often employs it to designate that state of mind, which trusts in his propitiatory sacrifice or blood as the means of salvation, in opposition to any trust or confidence in our own merit as the ground of acceptance. But to aver, that the author of our epistle does not disclose similar views in regard to the nature and importance of *faith* or *belief* in Christ, seems to be quite contrary to the whole tenor of the epistle. What is the object of the whole? Plainly to prevent apostasy, i. e. renunciation of belief in Christ. But why is such a renunciation criminal and dangerous? Because Christ is of infinite dignity, and because, when belief in his blood is renounced, "there remaineth no further sacrifice for sin." To what purpose is the awful example of the effects of unbelief, proposed in chapter III., except to warn the Hebrews against renouncing belief in Christ? To what purpose are the parallels drawn, in chapters III—X., between Christ and Moses; Christ and Melchisedek; and also between the great high priest of the Christian religion, and the Jewish priests; between the sacrifice offered by the former, and the sacrifices made by the latter, but for the sake of warning the Hebrews against renouncing their *faith in Christ*? Plainly for no other purpose. All the warnings, reproofs, and tremendous denunciations in the epistle, converge to the same point; they all have a bearing upon the same specific object.

In respect to the allegation, that *faith*, in our epistle, is employed to denote belief or confidence in the declarations of God, specially with regard to the objects of a *future world*; this is true. But it is true, also, that Paul, in his acknowledged epistles, employs it in a similar manner. E. g. in Rom. 4: 17—23, Paul represents Abraham, under the most unpromising circumstances, as believing that God would raise up from him, already *νενεκρωμένον*, a numerous progeny. This belief he represents as an act of faith, *ἐπίστευσε—μὴ ἀσθνηήσας τῇ πίστει—οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ—πληροφωρηθεὶς—ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ [ἡ πίστις] εἰς δικ. υ. οὐνήν*. On the other hand, our epistle, 11: 8 seq., represents Abraham as going out from his country, and sojourning in a strange land, *πίσει*. By *faith*, also he obtained a son, even when he was *νενεκρωμένος*, 11: 12, from whom a numerous progeny

was to spring. Both these accounts characterise this whole transaction, in the same way. Both describe the same acts as being *faith*, on the part of Abraham. Both describe his physical state, by calling him *νενεχωμένον*. Both treat the whole transaction as a rare instance of the power of faith, and appeal to it as an example most worthy of imitation. Surely here is something different from *discrepancy* of views in these writers. Is there not a *coincidence*, which is altogether striking, both in the manner and language of the epistles?

But there are other circumstances, in the account of Abraham, which deserve distinct notice. Paul, in Rom. 4: 17 seq., represents Abraham as believing the divine assurance, that he should become the father of many nations; the assurance of that God, ‘who restoreth the dead to life, and calleth things that are not, into being.’ In this expression, the apostle evidently refers to the belief which Abraham entertained, that, in case he offered up Isaac as a sacrifice, God could and would raise him from the dead, or call another son into being, from whom a numerous progeny should descend.

So in Heb. 11: 17 seq., the writer represents Abraham as offering up Isaac, in *faith* that God was able to raise him from the dead, from whence, as it were, he did obtain him, i. e. Isaac sprung from one apparently *νενεχωμένος*, v. 12. In both cases the writers have characterised the state of Abraham’s mind, on this occasion, by representing it as *faith*, *ἐπίστυσε, πίστευε*. In both, they disclose the same specific views of the point on which the faith of Abraham rested, and they characterise it in the same way.

Is not here a minute coincidence of thought, expression, and manner of representing faith, which creates strong presumption in favour of the opinion, that the writer in both cases was the same person?

Again, in Heb. xi., Noah is represented as being divinely admonished respecting future occurrences, and as preparing an ark for his safety, in consequence of his *faith* in the admonition which he had received. The writer then proceeds to say, that by this act, he became an heir *τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης*, of that justifi-

*cation which is by faith*; the very expression, and the very idea, which Paul so often repeats in his acknowledged epistles, viz. those to the Romans and Galatians. What other writer of the New Testament, except Paul, has employed such an expression?

It is true, indeed, that the author of our epistle does represent faith, in Heb. xi., as confidence in the declarations of God respecting future things. But it is equally true, that this was the view of it which he was naturally led to present, from the circumstances of the case before him. His appeal was to the worthies of former days, as examples of *belief*. Belief in what? Not in Christianity surely, which had not then been revealed. Could the writer, when characterising the actual nature of their *faith*, represent it as a belief in that which was *not yet disclosed* to them? Surely not; but he must represent, and does represent it, as a belief in what God *had disclosed* to them. The nature of the case rendered it impossible, that their faith should be represented in any other light than this.

Just so Paul, in Rom. iv., represents the faith of Abraham as *justifying faith*, and appeals to it in proof of the fact, that faith is a means of justification. Yet not a word is said there of Abraham's belief in Christ. In what respect does this case differ from that of all the examples cited in Heb. xi? Rather, is there not a *sameness of principle* in the two instances of faith? Both respect *future* things depending on the promise of God; neither have any special reference to Christ.

The truth is, that *faith*, in its *generic* nature, is *belief* or *confidence in the promises or revelations of God*. Now whether these respect things future, things of another world, or things past, or the nature, character, offices, and work of the Messiah, faith receives them all. Faith, therefore, in the ancients, who gave entire credit to what was revealed to them, was the same *principle* as faith in him who believes in Christ, because Christ is proposed to him. Circumstances only make any apparent difference in the case. The *disposition* is always the same.

That Paul thought thus of this subject, is clear enough from the example of Abraham, which he cites as a signal instance of justifying faith, in Rom. iv. But besides this, we have other

proof, that Paul has not always represented faith as having reference only to Christ, but also represented it, as it commonly appears in our epistle. So 2 Cor. 5: 7, *We walk by faith and not by sight*, i. e. we live as those who confide or believe in the realities of a future world, not like those who regard only visible objects. So too, in 1 Cor. 13: 13. In 1 Thess. 1: 8, we have *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*; 1 Cor. 12: 9, *πίστις ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι*. So in 1 Cor. 13: 2. 2 Cor. 4: 13. Eph. 6: 16. 1 Thess. 5: 8, and in many other passages, faith has a variety of meanings, and is not limited to belief in Christ only.

I am unable to see, therefore, why this argument should be so strenuously urged, as it is by Schulz and others, and relied upon as so decisive. I can see no other difference between the *faith* of our epistle, and that which the writings of Paul present, than what the nature of the examples to which our author appealed necessarily requires. When Paul makes a like appeal, he treats the subject in the same way, Rom. iv. And nothing can be farther from correctness, than to aver, that Paul always employs *πίστις* in the sense of *Christianity, believing on Christ*. Merely opening a Greek lexicon or concordance, on the word *πίστις*, is ample refutation of this assertion. Paul employs the word, in all the latitude which is elsewhere given it in the New Testament; and that embraces a great variety of specific significations, nearly all of which range themselves under the general idea of *confidence in the divine declarations*.

That it is the great object of our epistle to inculcate belief in Christ, and to warn the Hebrews against unbelief, I suppose will not be denied. What foundation, then, can Schulz have for saying, that “the Pauline idea of belief is altogether foreign to this writer?” Above all, how could he add, “A sentence, like the Pauline one, *ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀμαρτία ἐστίν*, would sound strange enough in the epistle to the Hebrews.” Yet strange as it may seem, in Heb. 11: 6, we have, *χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι* [θεῷ].

On the whole, the representation of faith, in our epistle, as it respects the case of Abraham and Noah, is not only exactly the same as that of Paul’s, but, in the mode of representation, are found such

strong resemblances, as to afford no inconsiderable ground for supposing that the writer of both must have been the same person.

(f) ‘*Σαρκικός*, in the sense of *transient, temporary*, is used only in the epistle to the Hebrews.’

But, first, this is a disputed reading. Not to rely on this, however, *σαρκικός* in the sense of *weak, imperfect*, is common in Paul; a sense substantially the same with the one demanded here. Bretschneider renders it, in Heb. 7: 16, *ad naturam animalem spectans*; which is a *usual* sense, but not admissible here, on account of the antithesis, *ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*. Let it be, then, an *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* as to sense here; are there not such in nearly all of Paul’s epistles? E. g. *ἐξουσία*, 1 Cor. 11: 10, in the sense of *veil*; in 1 Cor. 9: 12, in the sense of *property*; and so of many other words.

(g) ‘The phrase *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα* Heb. 2: 5, for the *Christian dispensation*, is no where found in Paul’s acknowledged epistles, in which he always employs *αἰὼν μέλλον*.’

But are not *οἰκουμένη* and *αἰὼν* employed as *synonymes* in the New Testament? Both correspond to the Heb. עָוֶל. Besides, in Heb. 6: 5, this very phrase, *αἰὼν μέλλον*, is employed by the writer in the sense of *Christian dispensation*. Must the same writer always employ the very same phraseology, when he has a choice of synonymous words?

Besides, it is not true that Paul uses the phrase *αἰὼν μέλλον* for the *Christian dispensation*. Once only does he employ it, Eph. 1: 21, and then simply in the sense of *future world*.

(h) ‘But where is Christ called a *high priest*, and an *apostle*, except in Heb. 3: 1? It cannot be imagined, that the reverence which the apostles bore to their master, would permit them to call him an *apostle*.’

As to the appellation *ἀρχιερέως*, nothing could be more natural, than for the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews to apply this to Christ. He labours to prove, that Christianity has a preference over Judaism in *all* respects; that, consequently, it has a *high-priest* exalted above the Jewish one. How could the writer avoid calling Christ a high priest? If Paul has no where done

this in his acknowledged epistles, it may be for the obvious reason, that he has no where drawn such a comparison in them.

In respect to *ἀπόστολος*, Wetstein has shewn, on John 9: 7, that one of the names which the Jews applied to their expected Messiah, was  $\text{קִרְיָשׁ}$ , i. e. *sent, apostle*. Besides, a common name of a prefect of the Jewish *synagogue*, was  $\text{קִרְיָשׁ הַבְּרִי}$ , *ἀπόστολος τῆς ἐκκλησίας*; in the Apocalypse, *ἄγγελος τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. Now the object of the writer, in Heb. 3: 1 seq. is, to compare Christ as appointed over the household of God, with Moses in a similar office. Since then  $\text{קִרְיָשׁ}$  meant *curator aedis sacrae, aedituus*, and such an office was the very object of comparison, nothing can be more natural, than that our author should have named Christ  $\text{קִרְיָשׁ}$ , i. e. *ἀπόστολος*. See Comm. on Heb. 3: 1.

And why should it be considered as incompatible with that reverence which Paul had for Christ, that he should call him *ἀπόστολος*? The same Paul, in Rom. 15: 8, calls Jesus Christ *διάκονον τῆς περιτομῆς*. Is *διάκονος* a more honorable appellation than *ἀπόστολος*? Or because Paul calls Christ *διάκονος*, in this case, are we to draw the inference, that he did not write the epistle to the Romans, since this word is no where else applied by him in this manner? Such a conclusion would be of the same nature, and of the same validity, as that which Bertholdt has drawn, from the use of *ἀπόστολος* and *ἀρχιερεύς*, in the epistle to the Hebrews.

Thus much for *words* and *phrases*. Bertholdt next brings forward *sentiments* in the epistle to the Hebrews, which are diverse, he says, from Paul's, if not in opposition to them.

(1.) 'In Heb. 10: 25 seq., the speedy coming of Christ is mentioned; and so it is often by Paul. But in the epistle to the Hebrews, it is evidently a *moral* coming, a *moral* change; whereas Paul every where speaks of it as an *actual, visible* coming of Christ.'

This difficulty depends entirely upon the writer's exegesis. Whatever the nature of the coming of Christ may be, I venture to say, it is palpably represented in the same manner, in the epis-



tle to the Hebrews and in the epistles of Paul. Indeed, so far has the representation, in the epistle to the Hebrews, appeared to be from being *plainly* a *moral* one, that some of the most distinguished commentators have understood it, as having respect to the *natural* changes that are to take place, when Christ shall come at the end of the world. So Storr; and others, also, before and after him. Paul surely has little or nothing, which more certainly designates the *actual, visible* coming of Christ, than this epistle. Comp. 1 Cor. 4: 5, 6. Phil. 1: 10. 4: 5. 1 Thess. 3: 13. 5: 1—6. 5: 23. 1 Tim. 6: 13—16. Tit. 2: 11—13. Compare, also, with these representations, 2 Thess. 2: 1—10, where Paul explains his views in respect to the coming of Christ. Indeed, so much alike is the representation of this subject, in the epistle to the Hebrews and in Paul's epistles, that many critics have used this very circumstance as a proof, that the author of both must have been the same person; an argument not valid, however, because the same representation is common to other writers of the New Testament. Still, the mention of this serves to show, that the exegesis of Bertholdt, in this case, is not to be relied on with such confidence as he places in it.

(2.) 'According to the epistle to the Hebrews, the propitiatory office of Christ continues *forever* in the heavenly world, 7: 24 seq.; whereas Paul, on the contrary, considers the atonement for men as already *completed*, by the death and resurrection of Jesus, Rom. 4: 25.'

This argument is surely not well chosen. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews says, in so many words, that the high priest of Christianity had no daily necessity, like the Jewish priests, to make offerings first for his own transgressions and then for those of the people; "for this he did once for all, when he made an offering of himself, 7: 27." And again; "Nor had he need often to repeat the sacrifice of himself, (as the high priest yearly enters into the holy place with blood not his own); for then he must have suffered often since the foundation of the world; but now, in this last age, he has appeared, once for all, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as all men die, once for all, and then go to the judgment; so Christ was offered

up, once for all, to take away the sins of many ; and when he shall make his second appearance, it will not be to atone for sin, but to bestow salvation on those who look for him, 9: 25—28.” How can words make it more certain, that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews considered the propitiation or atonement as entirely *completed*, by the death of Christ ?

It is true, indeed, that the same author also represents Christ as forever living, and exercising the duties of his office as an intercessor (or helper) for the saints, before God ; “ He, because he continueth forever, hath an unchangeable priesthood ; whence he is able to save to the uttermost those who come unto God through him, since he ever lives to intercede for (*ἐντιγγάρειν to help*) them, 7: 24, 25.” With which agrees another representation, in 9: 24 ; “ Christ has entered into heaven itself, henceforth to appear before God for us.”

But are these sentiments foreign to Paul, as Bertholdt alleges ? “ Who shall accuse the elect of God ?—God acquits them. Who shall pass sentence of condemnation upon them ? Christ, who died for them ? Rather, who is risen again, who is at the right hand of God, and who intercedes for (*ἐντιγγάρειν helps*) them, Rom. 8: 33.”

Here is not only the very same idea, as in the epistle to the Hebrews, but even the very same term (*ἐντιγγάρειν*) is used in both. Instead then of affording any evidence *against* the opinion, that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, the point in question affords evidence in favour of it. Paul, and Paul only, of all the apostolic authors, has presented the idea of the *intercession* of Christ in the heavenly world. To say the least, the whole mode of representing this subject is Pauline. The only difference between the epistle to the Romans and the epistle to the Hebrews, is, that in the latter case, the nature of the argument which the writer had employed, required him to represent Christ as performing the functions of a priest in the heavenly world. But it is palpably the intercessory function, which he is represented as continuing there to perform, in the passages which I have cited.

(3.) ‘The doctrine respecting the *Logos*, in the epistle to the

Hebrews, is of Alexandrine hue, and evidently resembles that of John, and not of Paul. E. g. the divine Logos (λόγος θεοῦ) is quick and powerful, etc., 4: 12, 13; also, Christ is a priest, κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκατάλυτου, 3: 16. So too, when Christ is represented as making an offering διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, 9: 14, this, as well as the other cases, coincides with the views and representations of John, and not of Paul.'

If now a critic will do such violence to the laws of exegesis, as to construe these passages so as to make them have respect to the doctrine of the *Logos*, the best way to answer him would be, to show that his principles of interpretation are without any good foundation. I cannot turn aside to do this here, as it more properly belongs to the exegetical part, which respects this epistle. I shall content myself with merely observing, that one of the last ideas, which can well be deduced from the passage respecting the *λόγος θεοῦ* just referred to, is that which Bertholdt has deduced from it; a deduction, which does equal violence to the context, and to the whole strain of reasoning, in our epistle. And where does *John* speak of Christ's *eternal priesthood*, or of his offering made in heaven διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου?

At the conclusion of the arguments which I have now reviewed, Bertholdt adds, "With such real discrepancies between the epistle to the Hebrews and those of Paul, it is impossible that identity of authorship should exist, p. 2943."

If, indeed, the discrepancies were made out as clearly as Bertholdt supposes them to be, there might be some difficulty in supposing identity of authorship; at least we could not suppose this, without at the same time conceding, that the writer was at variance in some measure with himself. But the conclusion which Bertholdt here draws, of course depends entirely on the fact, that all his allegations in respect to discrepancies of style and sentiment are well supported. Whether this be so, must now be left to the reader to judge.

But there are other recent writers, who remain to be examined, that have gone into the subject under discussion much more thoroughly and copiously than Bertholdt. I refer in particular, to Dr. Schulz of Breslau, in the introduction to his *Translation*

of the epistle to the Hebrews, with brief notes, published A. D. 1818; and to Seyffarth, in his tract, *De Epistolæ ad Heb. indole maxime peculiari*. This last work especially, has been spoken of with strong commendations by many critics; and Heinrichs, who in the first edition of his *Commentary on the Hebrews*, defended the Pauline origin of our epistle, has, in the second edition of the same, declared himself a convert to the side of those who disclaim Paul as the author; attributing his conviction principally to the essay of Seyffarth just mentioned. As these works are the latest critical attempts to discuss at length the question under examination, and as they have manifestly had no small degree of influence, upon the views of most of the continental critics of the present time, a particular examination of them becomes necessary.

#### § 27. *Objections of Schulz considered.*

That Dr. Schulz is a man entitled to high respect for acuteness and strength of intellectual power, is sufficiently manifest, from his work on the Sacrament, entitled *Die christl. Lehre vom heil. Abendmahle, nach dem Grundtexte des N. Testaments*, A. D. 1824; a work, which, from the talent it develops, and the discussion that it has excited, bids fair perhaps to bring this long controverted subject to some close, in the Lutheran church. His acquisitions of a *philological* nature are such, also, that great expectations were excited among not a few in Germany, (if the Reviews are to be credited), when it was announced that Dr. Schulz's commentary on our epistle was about to appear. I make these remarks principally to show, that a particular attention to his work is not only allowable on the present occasion, but really necessary, if one would even seem to preserve the attitude of impartiality.

This work was published a year before Bertholdt's volume, which contains the views that I have just examined. But this writer informs us, that he had not seen the work of Schulz, when his own went to the press; consequently, this author, so far as we are now concerned, may be considered as posterior to Bertholdt.

Nearly the whole *Introduction* of Schulz, is devoted to the

consideration of the question, Who was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews? or rather, to showing that Paul was not the author, pp.1—158. Previously to writing this, the author had been engaged in controversy on the subject, with his colleague Scheibel. The whole work bears the appearance of a heated, if not an exasperated state of mind; and while it discloses some vivid thoughts, and pungent considerations, it also discloses some adventurous remarks, and extravagant criticisms; to which, the sequel of this examination will bear testimony.

The first fifty pages are devoted to the examination of Meyer's *Essay, on the internal grounds for supposing that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul.*\* In this are some remarks worthy of consideration, and which may serve to shew that Meyer, in some cases, has pushed his comparisons too far. It is not to my purpose, however, to review this; as the subject has already been presented above, in § 21. My only object is, to select from Schulz such arguments against the Pauline origin of our epistle, as have not already been examined, in order that the reader may obtain a full view of our subject. These arguments I shall now subjoin, with such remarks upon each, as the nature of the case may seem to require.

(1.) 'It is incomprehensible, and indeed quite impossible, that, if Paul wrote this epistle, early Christian antiquity should have been so doubtful about it, and the epistle itself have been received by the church so late, and with so much difficulty; and after all, received only by some, and not at all by the generality of Christians. Such a fate did no other book of the New Testament meet with; not even the epistles which are addressed to individual persons, p. 58.'

This objection borrows all its importance, from assuming the fact, that our epistle was early and generally doubted in the churches, and at last but partially and doubtfully received. Whether Schulz had any good right to assume such a fact, must be left to the judgment of those, who have read and weigh-

---

\* Printed in Ammon and Bertholdt's *Kritisches Journal der neuesten theol. Literatur.* II. 225 seq.

ed with impartiality, the historical evidence already laid before them. It is unnecessary to retrace the ground here, which has once been passed over. The state of facts is far enough from shewing, that all early Christians were doubtful about this epistle; nor can it be rendered probable, in any way, that doubts about it, at any period, had their origin in any *ancient* tradition that the epistle was not written by Paul. The doubts suggested are merely of a *critical* nature, or else they originated in *doctrinal* opinions, which seemed to be thwarted by our epistle.

Nor is it correct, that other parts of the New Testament were not early doubted, by some churches; nay some of it, was doubted by many. Witness the fact, that Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* III. 25, classes among the *ἀντιλεγόμενοι*, James, Jude, 2 Pet., 2 John, and 3 John. Witness the fact, that the old Syriac version (Peshito) does not comprise either of these epistles, that of James excepted. Who, that is acquainted with the early state of criticism, and the history of our Canon, does not know that the ancient churches were not, for a long time, agreed in respect to all these epistles? Yet neither Schulz, nor any considerate critic, would decide that these books were spurious, because doubts had been raised respecting them. Are not the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John doubted, and called in question by some learned critics, even at the present time? Shall they be given up, because they are called in question?

(2.) ‘The epistle to the Hebrews is altogether *unique*; so much so, that no other writer of the New Testament could have produced it. Every one who can comprehend peculiarities, and is able to distinguish them, must acknowledge this to be so. Nothing more than this fact needs to be considered, in order to decide the matter, p. 59.’

If the writer here means that the *style* is *unique*, then I must refer to the evidences of the contrary in the preceding pages. If he means, that the selection of particular *words* is *unique*, this is to be hereafter considered, when the selection, which Dr. Schulz has made, comes to be examined. If he means, that the *matter* is *sui generis*, I readily accede; but I demur to the allegation. Must Paul always write on one and

the same subject, to all the churches? Were their circumstances and wants all just the *same*? E. g. is the first epistle to the Corinthians just like that to the Romans, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, etc.; or is it a kind of ἄπαξ λεγόμενον, or ἄπαξ λογιζόμενον, compared with all the other epistles of Paul? Surely none of the others has much resemblance to it, in respect to the *matters* treated of. Does it then follow, that this epistle is *spurious*, because the subjects of it are *sui generis*? And is it any better evidence, that the epistle to the Hebrews does not belong to Paul, because the subjects of which it treats are *peculiar*? When we can prove, that the wants of all churches are one and the same; and that an apostle who addresses them can write, or ought to write, only upon one subject, and in one way; then, and not till then, can this argument of Schulz have any weight in deciding the question before us.

(3.) ‘The Hebrews addressed in this epistle are of a peculiar class. They seem to have regarded themselves as a species of *illuminati*, elect, and favorites of heaven; as animated by the Holy Spirit dwelling in them; they are represented as despising the world, as inclined to mystical and allegorical views, as aiming at the acquisition of unearthly objects, etc. The epistle wins much for its exegesis, by such a supposition, p. 67 seq.’

But supposing, now, all this to be correct, (which it would be difficult enough satisfactorily to prove), how would it show that Paul did not write our epistle to them? And surely, if the Hebrews had such views of themselves, what the apostle says, in chapter v. vi., and in some other places, was well adapted to humble them, and bring them to sober consideration.

The proof, on which Dr. Schulz relies for the establishment of his assertion, is drawn from the use, by the writer of our epistle, of such terms as ἅγιοι, κοιμισθέντες, τέλειοι, ἀγιοζόμενοι, λάος τοῦ θεοῦ, etc. But these are terms applied to Christians, every where in the New Testament, and to the use of which, nothing peculiar in our epistle can be justly attributed.

(4.) ‘The author of this epistle was a Judaizing Christian, who grants that Judaism is still to continue, yea to have a perpetual duration. Not a trace of any thing is to be found, which

intimates an equal participation in the privileges of the gospel by Jews and Gentiles, pp. 74. 80.’

The *first* of these allegations is, so far as I know, *altogether new*. Nothing more need be said in respect to it, than to refer the reader to chapters viii—x., for most ample and satisfactory confutation. I had ever thought, before reading Dr. Schulz, that the writer of our epistle was the last of men who could be justly accused of *Judaizing*. If his views do not agree with those of Paul, in respect to this matter, I am unable to see how language could express them.

In regard to the *second* allegation ; it is sufficient to say, that the object of the writer did not lead him to treat of the subject to which it relates. Are there not other epistles of Paul, which do not bring this subject to view ? And must a writer always repeat the same topics ? In what part of the first epistle to the Corinthians does Paul treat of the equal participation of Jews and Gentiles in the privileges of the gospel, and maintain the equal right of the latter ; as he does in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians ? And is it not enough to say, that he did not do this, because the occasion did not demand it ?

(5.) ‘But Christ, in our epistle, appears every where as the *Son of God*, as *apostle*, and *high priest*. Where is he so represented by Paul ? p. 81 seq.’

In regard to the appellation, *Son of God*, it is often enough given to Christ by Paul. In respect to *ἀπόστολος* and *ἀρχιερεύς*, he is not so called, indeed, by the apostle in his acknowledged epistles. The only reason why the writer of our epistle calls him so, is obviously one drawn from the nature of the comparison instituted between him and Moses, and between him and the Jewish high priest. The nature of the composition and the object of the writer, rendered this unavoidable. In the acknowledged epistles of Paul, no such occasion is presented of using the appellations in question. See above, p. 189.

(6.) ‘The design of the writer is *hortatory*. The motives which he urges to continue stedfast in the Christian belief, and in the practice of Christian virtue, are drawn, (1.) From the great dignity of the Messiah. (2.) From the danger to which apostasy



would expose them. This danger is augmented by the consideration, that the *end of the world is near at hand*, p. 86 seq. Storr, and others, who differ in their exegesis of passages which declare this, scarcely deserve contradiction, p. 91.'

The whole force of this rests, of course, upon the correctness of Dr. Schulz's exegesis. From his views, in regard to such passages as 10: 36 seq. and 12: 26 seq., I feel myself compelled entirely to dissent. But even if they are allowed, I see not how they can establish the fact, that Paul did not write our epistle, provided we stand upon the same ground with Dr. Schulz. He will not deny that Paul had exalted views of the dignity of the Saviour, and of the obligation of Christians to continue steadfast in their acknowledg'ment to him. He believes that Paul, too, expected the end of the world to be actually near at hand. What is there, then, in the sentiments of our epistle, inconsistent with these views of Paul, as understood by him?

(7.) 'Our author says nothing of Christ as judge of the world, but uniformly attributes judgment to God. Nor does he say a word of Hades, Gehenna, Satan (excepting in 2: 14, 15), the resurrection of the dead, and generally of the closing scene of all things; of which matters Paul treats so copiously, p. 95 seq.'

But surely the final close or destruction of all material things, is sufficiently intimated in 1: 10 seq.; future punishment in 4: 11 seq. 6: 4 seq. 10: 26 seq. 12: 29. That the names *Hades* and *Gehenna* do not occur in our epistle, would be a singular argument to prove that Paul did not write it. Where, in all the acknowledged epistles of Paul, is either of these words to be found, excepting in one solitary quotation in 1 Cor. 15: 55, which exhibits ᾠδης? As to *Satan*, this appellation does not indeed occur; but its equivalent *διάβολος* occurs, in 2: 14. The word *Satan* does not occur in Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon; are these epistles therefore *spurious*?

In regard to the *resurrection of the dead*, it is sufficient to refer to 6: 2. 11: 35. and what is implied in 12: 22 seq.

That the writer of our epistle did not make frequent mention

of these topics, is easily accounted for, on the ground that he was more immediately occupied with other ones. Are there not several of Paul's acknowledged epistles, which omit the same topics? But who undertakes to prove from this, that they are spurious?

(8.) 'But not a word of Christ's resurrection; a theme on which Paul every where descants, p. 97.'

What then does Heb. 13: 20 mean? And what is implied in 8: 1. 1: 3. 10: 12. 12: 2. 2: 9. 5: 7—9? And will Dr. Schulz point out the places, where Paul discusses this subject in his epistles to the Galatians, Colossians, in the second to the Thessalonians, in the first to Timothy and some others?

(9.) 'If Paul did not become wholly unlike himself, and change his very nature, he could not have written the epistle to the Hebrews; which not only contains ideas foreign to his, but opposed to his, p. 101.'

This is *assertion*, not *argument*. The only way to convince those who differ in opinion from us, is to offer *arguments* for what we avouch; not merely to assume or assert it to be true.

(10.) 'The grand point of Paul's doctrines is, that Christ is the *Saviour of all*; that he died, or made atonement, *for all*. There is nothing of this in our epistle. Paul every where makes *belief in Christ* essential to salvation, and looks with contempt upon Jewish rites and ceremonies. But our author evidently handles Judaism with a sparing hand, and treats with honour the shell, from which he endeavours to extract the nut, p. 102 seq.'

In regard to the first of these allegations, the reader is referred to Heb. 2: 9—11. 5: 9. 9: 15, 28. 13: 10; which afford hints sufficiently plain, that the writer did not regard the Messiah as the Saviour of the Jews only. But to treat, in our epistle, of the extent of his salvation among the Gentiles, plainly was not apposite to the particular design he had in view; and he might abstain from this topic, out of regard to the prejudices which those whom he addressed probably entertained, (in common with most Jews), respecting it. Are there none of the acknowledged Pauline epistles, which do not treat of this subject? And must

Paul always bring it into view, whether to do so would be timely or untimely, apposite or inapposite to the object of his epistle?

In respect to the *Judaizing* spirit of the writer, I must refer once more to chap. viii—x.; and what has already been said above, in examining the fourth objection. And with regard to belief in Christ as essential to salvation, the great object of all the epistle to the Hebrews is to urge it. Dispute with one who denies this, would surely be in vain.

(11.) ‘ Paul no where represents Christ as a priest, nor his intercession as procuring favours for them, p. 109 seq.’

In respect to this objection, I refer the reader to what has already been said, pp. 189 h and 191 (2).

(12.) ‘ Paul has no where drawn a parallel between Christ and Moses, p. 111.’

But he did something very much like it, when he represented Moses and Christ as *mediators*, Gal. 3: 19 seq. And if he has not formally done it, in any of his acknowledged epistles, it is enough to say, it was because the occasion did not call for it.

(13.) ‘ Our author says nothing of the *kingdom of God*, or the *kingdom of Satan*, or of the *gospel of Jesus Christ*; ideas predominant in Paul’s epistles, p. 115.’

But is not a kingdom ascribed to Christ in Heb 1: 8, 9. 1: 10 seq. 2: 7 seq. 10: 13. 12: 2? And are not Christians represented as belonging to it, in 12: 28? And are the second epistle to the Corinthians, and the epistle to the Philippians not genuine, because the first of these phrases is not in them? Is not the power or reign of Satan recognised, in Heb 2: 14, 15? And as to *εὐαγγέλιον*, see 4: 2. 4: 6. Apply, too, the same method of reasoning to Paul’s acknowledged epistles. *Εὐαγγελίζω* is a favourite word with this apostle; yet Philippians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, do not exhibit it. The word *εὐαγγέλιον*, too, is not found in the epistle to Titus. But is not the *thing*, which it indicates, found there? It is; and so it is in Hebrews, as frequently as the nature of the case required; e. g. 1: 1. 2: 1, 3. 4: 1, 2. 5: 12. 6: 1 seq. 10: 25. 13: 8, 9, 17.

(14) ‘ How such expressions respecting the resurrection, as occur in 1 Cor. 15: 5 seq. Rom. 16: 4. 11: 15. Phil. 3: 20

seq. Col 2: 13. 1 Thess. 4: 15 seq. 2 Thess. 11. 2 Tim. 2: 18, with Acts 24: 15. 26: 6 seq., are to be reconciled with the views of the resurrection presented in our epistle, those who defend the genuineness of the epistle may be called on to account for, p. 116.'

In some of these citations, I can find no reference at all to the resurrection. In others (e. g. Col. 2: 13), there is simply a *figurative* or *moral* use of the term. As to the remainder, I can perceive no discrepancy between them and Heb. 6: 2. 11: 35 and what is implied in 12: 22 seq. As Schulz has not pointed out in what the discrepancy consists, I am unable to apprehend it.

(15.) 'But 1 Cor. 15: 24 seq. is at variance with Heb. 1: 2, 8 seq. 12, 13. 7: 24 seq. comp. v. 16. 9: 14. p. 116.'

Just as much as it is with Luke 1: 33. Dan. 2: 44. 7: 14. Mic. 4: 7. John 12: 34. Is. 9: 6. Ps 89: 36. 2 Sam. 7: 16; and no more. What interpreter, who has carefully studied the idiom of the Scriptures, does not know that  $\text{עַדְּוָעַד}$ ,  $\text{עַדְּוָעַד}$ , and  $\text{εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων}$ , are applied to things, to which a time of continuance is assigned, that is not liable to interruption by any *adventitious* circumstances, and which are to endure to the full period for which they were designed? So it is with *the world, the mountains, the hills*; they are  $\text{עַדְּוָעַד}$ ,  $\text{εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας}$ . So also, the *mediatorial reign* is not to be interrupted, but to continue until all the designs of God in the redemption of men are completed. Then, of course, it must cease; as no more mediatorial offices are to be performed.

And why too should Dr. Schulz suggest such a consideration, as a proof that Paul did not write the epistle to the Hebrews, when he makes no difficulty at all in suggesting, that the sacred writers are not unfrequently at variance with themselves? To allege the fact of *variance*, then, either with each other or with themselves, is no valid argument, on the ground upon which he stands. He is not, here, consistent with himself. And besides, has not Paul himself recognised the *perpetuity* of Christ's dominion, in his acknowledged epistles? See Rom. 9: 5.

(16.) 'The writer of our epistle, entangled with types and allegories, knows not how to say any thing respecting Christianity, except what he finds an analogy for in Judaism; so that his

work is made up of parallels between the old and new dispensation, spun out to an excessive length. . . . The limited circle in which this writer moves, his evident deficiency in activity of mind, and in unfolding his own views, are altogether unlike the active, creative mind of Paul, that master-spirit, who moves with such perfect freedom, and controls at pleasure all his own views, without any subjection to the influence of others, or even being at all affected by any thing of Jewish origin ; all of which was entirely at his command. . . . Whoever should attribute this singular production to Paul, would show that he was little acquainted with him, p. 119.?

Yet, in p. 124, Dr. Schulz says, " One finds in the unknown author [of our epistle], more orderly deduction, more learned accuracy, and, for the most part, a well arranged, gradual ascent, from the point where he starts, which he usually establishes by quotations from the Old Testament, to the sublime region, to which, as true, eternal, and heavenly, he directs every thing, and where he ends every thing ; finally, more luxurious, oratorical qualities, than in Paul."

How this consists with the preceding representation, the writer of both may well be required to show. The reader, I am sure, must find difficulty enough to make them harmonize. But, at any rate, the accusation that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is not master of his own subject and own thoughts, is, so far as I know, *new* ; and one which, (as I shall confidently believe, until I see more evidence to the contrary), it is unnecessary to answer.

(17.) ' Heb. 2: 1, 2 proves that Paul could not have been the writer of our epistle ; for he did not receive his gospel from others, but was immediately taught it by Christ himself, Gal. 1: 11, 12. 5: 15—19. p. 125 seq. '

On the subject of this objection, the reader is referred to p. 38 c. I add here only, that if the use of the *first person plural* by the writer, necessarily makes him one, in all respects, with those whom he is addressing, then the author of our epistle did himself need the admonitions which he has so powerfully and feelingly addressed to others ; see 2: 1, 3. 3: 6. 4: 1, 2, 11, 13, 16.

6: 1—3, 18, 19. 10: 22—25, 26, 39. 11: 40. 12: 1, 9, 10, 28. 13: 10, 13, 15. Nay, he must have included himself among those who were shaken in their Christian belief, and who were in imminent hazard of final apostasy.

On the other hand; nothing can be plainer, than that he uses *we* or *ye* indifferently, for the persons whom he addresses; e. g. *we*, in 12: 1, 2; *ye*, in 12: 3—8; *we*, in 12: 9, 10; *ye*, in 12: 14—25; *we*, in 13: 25—28, and often in the same manner elsewhere, the address being still most manifestly made to the very same persons. He often employs, also, the first person plural (*ἡμεῖς*), to designate *merely himself*; e. g. in Heb. 2: 5. 6: 9, 11. 13: 18. This, in like manner, he interchanges with the first person singular; e. g. 13: 18, comp. 13: 19, 22, 23.

How can it be, now, that Dr. Schulz should so strenuously urge the argument drawn from the use of the *first person plural*, to show that the writer of our epistle received his knowledge of the gospel from apostles and disciples, and of course that he could not be Paul? Yet he not only urges it at length, pp. 125—130, but declares, that ‘it affords a decisive proof, that the apostle Paul could not have written the epistle in question, p. 126.’ Especially, how could he urge such an argument, when the same use of the first person plural, runs through all the Pauline epistle: e. g. *ἡμεῖς* and *ἐγώ* for the writer himself, Gal. 1: 8. comp. 1: 9—24. Gal. 2: 5. comp. 2: 1—4, and 2: 6, 7. So *ἡμεῖς* and *ὑμεῖς* for the persons addressed, Gal. 3: 1—12. 3: 13—25. 3: 26—29. 4: 3—5. 4: 6—20. 4: 26—31, et alibi. Is it possible, then, to attribute any weight to such an argument as that in question?

(18.) ‘The manner of citing or appealing to the Old Testament, by Paul and by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, is very different. Paul appeals to it as a *written record*; but the writer of our epistle every where cites it as the immediate word of God, or of the Holy Ghost. Paul’s formulas of citation are, *γράφεται, καθὼς γέγραπται, ἢ γραφὴ λέγει, ἐγράφη, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὁ λόγος γεγραμμένος, Μοϋσῆος γράμει—λέγει, ὁ νόμος λέγει, ἐν Μοϋσῆος νόμῳ γέγραπται, Δαβὶδ λέγει, Ἰσραὴλ λέγει—κράζει, ἐν τῷ Ψαλμῷ λέγει, and κατὰ τὸ εἰρημνιον*; which

are not used in a single instance, in the epistle to the Hebrews. Instead of these formulas, the author uses λέγει—μαρτύρει—τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, λέγει ὁ θεός, or the abridgments of these formulas viz. λέγει, εἶρηκε, μαρτύρει, γησί. Does not such a diversity necessarily imply diversity of authorship? p. 120 seq.†

To this representation of Dr. Schulz, Seyffarth has not only assented, but in his *Essay on the Peculiarities of the epistle to the Hebrews*,\* he has placed the modes of appeal to the Jewish Scriptures at the head of these peculiarities, so far as the style of the author is concerned; “referenda huc est, prae ceteris omnibus, loca Vet. Test. laudandi singularis ratio.” Dr. Schulz moreover says, ‘that plainly Paul makes less frequent use, in general, of the Old Testament Scriptures, than is made of them in the epistle to the Hebrews;’ an objection which has been frequently alleged by others.

The result of an attentive and repeated examination of our epistle, and of all the acknowledged Pauline epistles, in respect to the mode and frequency of quotation, has led me to conclusions somewhat different from those which Schulz and Seyffarth have adopted. I shall present them, with my reasons for adopting them.

(a) The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is by no means uniform, in his mode of appeal to the Jewish Scriptures. In twenty one cases, viz. 1: 5. 1: 6. 1: 7. 2: 12. 3: 7. 4: 3. 5: 5. 5: 6. 6: 4. 7: 17. 7: 21. 8: 5. 8: 8. 9: 20. 10: 5. 10: 8. 10: 9. 10: 15. 10: 30. 12: 26. 13: 5. he has used εἶπεν, εἶρηκε, λέγει, λέγων, μαρτύρει, γησί with a nominative never expressed, except in three instances, viz. Heb. 3: 7. 6: 14 by implication, and 10: 15. In fourteen of these cases, we may gather from the context, that θεός or κύριος is the probable nominative, i. e. the one which the writer meant his readers should supply. Four of the cases have Χριστός or Ἰησοῦς for a nominative, viz. 2: 13. 10: 5. 10: 8. 10: 9, which is implied; two of them have τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον expressed, viz. 3: 7. 10: 15. and one only has θεός expressed, and that because it was unavoidable 6: 14.

In five cases more, which are introduced merely with πάλιν,

\* De epistolae ad Heb. indole, §§ 53—60.

καί, or δέ, viz. 1: 5. 1: 8. 1: 10. 2: 13. 10: 30, but stand connected with a preceding quotation, the grammatical connexion requires us to supply εἶπε, λέγων, λέγει, etc. i. e. κύριος or θεός λέγει, εἶπε, etc. In two cases of the like nature, viz. 2: 13. 2: 14, Ἰησοῦς or Χριστός is the implied nominative. In the whole, there are *twenty five* instances of quotation in which the nominative is *not* expressed, in *nineteen* cases of which it probably is θεός, and Χριστός in the other *six*. There are *two* cases only, in which the nominative τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is expressed; and *one* only where θεός is actually inserted.

If one might trust to the representations of Dr. Schulz and Seyffarth, he must, of course, be led to believe, that these are all the kinds of quotation, which our epistle presents. This however is not the case. In 2: 6, we have διημαρτύρατο δέ που τίς, viz. Δαβὶδ; in 3: 15, ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, when it is said, (like רַבִּינֵי־שֵׁץ in the Mishna); in 4: 4, εἶρηκε γὰρ σου, sc. ἡ γραφή plainly, which formula is repeated by πάλιν in 4: 5; in 4: 7, we find ἐν Δαβὶδ λέγων, saying by David; in 9: 20, Μωϋσῆς—λέγων; in 11: 18, ἐλαλήθη, (like רַבִּינֵי־שֵׁץ); in 12: 5, παρακλήσεως: in 12: 20, τὸ διαστελλόμενον: in 12: 21, Μωϋσῆς εἶπε: in 12: 27, τὸ δέ; in 13: 6, ὥστε ἡμᾶς λέγειν, so that we may say. Besides this, we have, in 3: 5. 10: 37. and 11: 21, quotations without any direct sign or notice of appeal; not to mention several references or partial quotations which might easily be subjoined. In the whole there are *fifteen* instances of quotation, (i. e. about *three eighths* of all the quotations), where the appeal is *different* from that which Schulz and Seyffarth attribute to our author, and on which they have built their argument against the Pauline origin of our epistle.

(b) There is a similar variety of appeal in the acknowledged Pauline epistles. E. g. καθὼς γέγραπται, γέγραπται γὰρ, or ἐν νόμῳ γέγραπται, are used in Romans sixteen times, viz. 1: 17. 2: 24. 3: 4. 3: 10. 4: 17. 8: 36. 9: 13. 9: 33. 10: 15. 11: 8. 11: 26. 12: 19. 14: 11. 15: 3. 15: 9. 15: 21. In 1 Corinthians nine times, viz. 1: 19. 1: 31. 2: 9. 3: 19. 9: 9. 10: 7. 14: 21. 15: 45. 15: 54. In 2 Corinthians three times, viz. 4: 13. 8: 15. 9: 9. In Galatians four times, viz. 3: 10. 3: 13. 4: 22.



4: 27; in all, thirty two. 'Η γραφή λέγει is used eight times, viz. Rom. 4: 3. 9: 17. 10: 11. 19: 2, probably Rom. 15: 10. 15: 11. 1 Cor. 6: 16. Gal. 4: 30. 'Ησαΐας λέγει, four times, viz. Rom. 10: 16. 10: 20. 10: 21. 15: 12. 'Ησαΐας κράζει, Rom 9: 27; 'Ησαΐας προσέφηκε, 9: 29; Μωϋσῆς λέγει, 10: 19; Μωϋσῆς γράφει, 10: 5; Δαβὶδ λέγει, 4: 16. 11: 9; ὁ νόμος ἔλεγε, 7: 7; ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη λέγει, 10: 6; τί λέγει [sc. ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη] 10: 9; χρηματισμὸς λέγει, 11: 4.

There are ten cases of quotation without any formula of appeal, viz. Rom. 9: 7. 10: 13. 10: 18. 11: 34. 12: 20. 1 Cor. 2: 16. 10: 26. 15: 27. Gal. 3: 11. 3: 12; not to mention many cases where partial reference is made, in both the phraseology and thought of the apostle, to passages in the Old Testament.

Where an appeal is expressly made to the Old Testament by Paul, in his acknowledged epistles, there is then a small majority of cases in which καθὼς γέγραπται, or its equivalents, are used, if we take the whole together. But in the epistle to the Romans, the other methods of quotation predominate. The ground of such appeals as Δαβὶδ, 'Ησαΐας, Μωϋσῆς—λέγει, will be the subject of remark by and by.

(c) The assertion of Schulz, that Paul no where uses the formula of appeal θεός, κύριος—λέγει, comes next to be examined; for on this has he and Seyffarth grounded the conclusion, that the same writer could not have been the author of the Pauline epistles and of the epistle to the Hebrews. Assertions made at random on this subject, cannot decide it. Let the appeal be made to facts.

Rom. 9: 12, ἐρόθήθη αὐτῇ viz. to Rebecca. But by whom was it said? By Jehovah, Gen. 25: 23. It is the λόγος Κυρίου or θεοῦ, then, to which appeal is necessarily made here. Rom. 9: 15. τῷ Μωϋσῆϊ λέγει [sc. ὁ Κύριος vel ὁ θεός]. Rom. 9: 25, ἐν τῷ Ὠσηέ λέγει [sc. ὁ θεός], just the same as in Heb. 4: 7, ἐν Δαβὶδ λέγων i. e. saying by Hosea, saying by David.

In 2 Cor. 6: 2, λέγει γὰρ, [sc. ὁ Κύριος]; 6: 16, εἶπεν ὁ θεός; 6: 17, λέγει Κύριος; 6: 18, λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ; Gal. 3: 16, οὐ λέγει [sc. ὁ θεός].

So much for the assertion, that Paul has never used the for-

mula of appeal, ὁ θεός λέγει, or λέγει κύριος. Dr. Schulz will surely not object, that the nominative κύριος or θεός is not *expressed* in all these cases; for it *never* is so, in the epistle to the Hebrews, with the exception of only one instance, viz. Heb. 6: 14. But other resemblances remain to be pointed out.

In Rom. 13: 9, τὸ γὰρ is prefixed to a quotation; and again, ἐν τῷ, Rom. 13: 9. In the same way is τὸ δέ used, Heb. 12: 27. In Rom. 4: 18, we find the perfect participle used, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον in Heb. 12: 20, τὸ διαστελλόμενον. In Rom. 9: 12, ἐρόήθη. Heb. 11: 18, ἐλαλήθη, and (equivalent to this) ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, 3: 15.

In regard to the assertion of Schulz and Seyffarth, 'that θεός, Χριστός, or πνεῦμα ἅγιον, is *always* the nominative to λέγει, εἶπε, etc., in the epistle to the Hebrews,' the following formulas may be consulted; viz. Heb. 2: 6, διεμαρτύρατο δέ που τις, [sc. Δαβὶδ]; 4: 4, εἶρηκε γὰρ [sc. ἡ γροαγή]; which is repeated by necessary implication, in 4: 5; 9: 20, Μωϋσῆς . . . λέγων 12: 21, Μωϋσῆς εἶπε, (either a quotation of a sacred traditional saying, or a reference to the Scriptures *ad sensum*): all cases of the same nature, as those which occur in Paul's acknowledged epistles.

Besides these, we have, in 12: 5, a quotation referred to by calling it παρὰ κλησιν, (comp. Rom. 11: 4, χρηματισμὸς λέγει); and in 13: 6, we are pointed to a text of Scripture by the expression, ὥστε ἡμᾶς λέγειν. There are several instances, also, of quotation without any formula of appeal; just as in Paul's acknowledged epistles.

(d) There is as great a difference between Paul's *acknowledged* epistles, in regard to the formulas and the frequency of quotation, from the Old Testament, as there is between the epistle to the Hebrews, and some of Paul's acknowledged epistles; nay, even a greater difference. E. g. in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the only formula of quotation is the verb γέγραπται, viz. 1 Cor. 1: 19. 1: 31. 2: 9. 3: 19. 3: 20. 9: 9. 10: 7. 14: 21. 15: 24, one case only excepted, 6: 16. Four times, quotation is made without any formula, viz. 1 Cor. 2: 16. 10: 26. 15: 27. 15: 32. Now in the epistle to the Romans, out of forty eight quotations, only sixteen are introduced with the same

formula; the others exhibiting all the variety above described. On the other hand, the second epistle to the Corinthians, is equally divided between the formulas, *ὡς γέγραπται*, and *λέγει, εἶπε* [sc. *ὁ θεός* or *κύριος*]; there being three of each kind, viz. *ὡς γέγραπται*, 2 Cor. 4: 13. 8: 15. 9: 9. *λέγει, εἶπε* [*ὁ θεός*], 6: 2. 6: 16. 6: 17. It has also two quotations without any formula, 9: 7. 13: 1. The epistle to the Galatians has four formulas with *γέγραπται*, Gal. 3: 10. 3: 13. 4: 22. 4: 27; one with *θεός* implied, 3: 16; and two without any formula, 3: 11. 3: 12.

In all the other Pauline epistles, to the Ephesians, Philipians, Colossians, Thessalonians, to Timothy and Titus, there are not more than four or five quotations of Scripture to be found.

Suppose now, that we take the epistle to the Romans, (one of the most undoubted of all Paul's epistles), as the model of this writer's quotations. Then the argument is conclusive, (on the ground which Schulz and Seyffarth have taken), against the genuineness of all his other acknowledged epistles, unless it be the second to the Corinthians, and that to the Galatians. Above all, what shall we say of the great majority of his epistles, which never quote the Old Testament at all? Can it be, that the same man wrote these, who has directly appealed no less than *forty eight* times to the Old Testament, in the epistle to the Romans, not to mention many other implicit references? And can it be, that when his formulas of reference are so diverse, as they are between this epistle and the first to the Corinthians, that the same person was the author of both? It is easy now to perceive, that if arguments can be built on such circumstances as these, then the genuineness of the greater portion of the Pauline epistles must of course be denied. Is Dr. Schulz prepared for such a conclusion?

(e) A word as to the *greater frequency* of quotations, in the epistle to the Hebrews. Let us compare it with that to the Romans, which it most of all resembles, in respect to discussion and method of argument. In the epistle to the Romans, there are, at least, *forty eight* quotations; in that to the Hebrews, *thirty four*. More may be made in each, if we reckon all the

cases of like phraseology or resemblances to the Old Testament, in the turn of thought, which may be found in both. Now the proportion of the epistle to the Romans to that of the Hebrews, in regard to *length*, is as fourteen to ten; the number of quotations as forty eight to thirty four; which would average nearly three and a half to a page, in each epistle; the proportion being nearly the same in both, but the excess, on the side of the epistle to the Romans. So much for the assertion, that the *frequency* of quotation in our epistle proves that Paul was not the author of it. If there be any weight in such an argument, it lies equally against the genuineness of the epistle to the Romans, compared with Paul's other epistles, which have no quotations at all.

(f) On the whole, then, the objection, drawn either from the *method* or the *frequency* of quotation, (*singularis ratio prae ceteris omnibus* of our epistle, as Seyffarth calls it), vanishes away upon close examination; or if adhered to, must disprove the genuineness of a major part of the acknowledged epistles of Paul. That Paul, in our epistle, should have more frequently than elsewhere used λέγει, εἶπεν, εἶρηκε, is altogether consonant with what we may suppose him to have done, when addressing the Hebrews. The usual and almost the only mode of quoting, prevalent among the Jews, in ancient times, appears to have been such; at least if we may judge of it as it appears in the Mishna, where מֵאֵין אֵין, מֵאֵין אֵין, it is said, as it is said, which is said, is almost the only formula in use. There is an obvious reason for this. Every Jew, being conversant with the Old Testament Scriptures, would of course know what was the kind and weight of the appeal, made by λέγει, εἶπε, (מֵאֵין אֵין); i. e. he would at once refer it to divine testimony. Hence, this abridged and natural mode of quotation prevails, in our epistle. But in writing to churches made up of both Jews and Gentiles, the latter of whom were of course less familiar with the Old Testament, and knew less where to look for passages quoted, it was more natural for the apostle, (as he has done in the epistle to the Romans), to say Μουῦσῆς λέγει, Ἐσαΐας λέγει, etc, so that the reference might be more definite. This is a sufficient reason to account for any differences in the *formula* of quotation, between our epistle and the other epistles of

Paul. The difference itself has, however, as we have seen, been greatly overrated. Nothing important, most plainly, can be made of it by higher criticism, in performing its office upon our epistle. What can be more improbable, too, than that such a master-spirit as Paul should cast all his letters in the same mould; always use the same round of expression; mechanically apply the same formulas of quotation; and forever repeat the same sentiments in the same language? And because he has not done so, in the epistle to the Hebrews, must it be wrested from him, by criticism which exacts such uniformity in a writer? Where is the writer of epistles, ancient or modern, who possessed any talents and free command of language, whose letters can be judged of by such a critical test as this?

(19.) 'The appellations given to the Saviour, in Paul's acknowledged epistles and in the epistle to the Hebrews, are so diverse, as to afford strong evidence that both did not originate from the same person. E. g. in the Pauline epistles, these appellations are either, *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*, *Χ. Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*, or *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. In innumerable passages is Christ referred to by these appellations; which are so characteristic of Paul's writings, that they are to be regarded as nearly the *constant established formulas*, by which he adverts to the Saviour. On the contrary, in the epistle to the Hebrews, the writer uses most commonly *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* or *ὁ υἱός*; he also employs, at times, *ὁ κύριος* or *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* simply. *Twice only* has he connected *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. This must appear *striking* to every unprejudiced person, and of importance, p. 139 seq.'

Striking, indeed, the argument may appear, in the form stated by Schulz; but an investigation, through the medium of a Concordance, will present a very different result from that which he has presented.

(a) In regard to *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* or *ὁ υἱός* being the most frequent appellation given to Christ by the writer of our epistle. the facts stand thus. Omitting dubious references, and all the names of Christ that are appellatives suggested merely by the occasion, (such as *ἀπόστολος*, *ἀρχιερεύς*, *ἀρχηγός σωτηρίας*—*τῆς πίστεως*,

μεσίτης, σωτήρ, and κληρόνομος), the writer refers to the Messiah, by some one of his usual titles, in thirty two places; in four of which only he calls him *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, viz. Heb. 4: 14. 6: 6. 7: 3. 10: 29. In eight other places he calls him *υἱός*, viz. 1: 1, 5 bis, 8. 3: 6. 5: 5, 8. 7: 28. In the Pauline epistles, these designations are used seventeen times, viz. Rom. 1: 3, 4, 9. 5: 10. 8: 3, 29, 32. 1 Cor. 1: 9. 15: 28. 2 Cor. 1: 19. Gal. 1: 16. 2: 20. 4: 4, 6. Eph. 4: 13. Col. 1: 13. 1 Thess. 1: 10.

(b) *Κύριος* is so far from being limited to the epistle to the Hebrews, in its application to Christ, that, if I have counted rightly, it is found in the acknowledged Pauline epistles, applied in the same way, one hundred and forty seven times, and is the most frequent appellation of any, except *Χριστός*. The cases where *κύριος* stands united with *Ἰησοῦς*, *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, etc. are exempted from this enumeration.

On the other hand, the writer of our epistle is so far from making a frequent use of this designation, that he has employed it singly in two places only, or at most three, viz. 2: 3. 7: 14, probably 12: 14.

That Schulz should make a representation so singularly incorrect, respecting the appellation *κύριος*, can be accounted for in no other way, than by supposing that he never examined his Concordance, for the sake of investigating the question respecting the use of it.

But further; in the epistle to the Romans, *κύριος* is applied to Christ not more than seventeen times; some may think, still less, in as much as the exegesis, in a few of the cases, may be doubtful. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, however, (which is about the same length), the same appellation is given to Christ forty five times; while, in the epistle to Titus it does not occur at all. Further, *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, or *Χριστός Ἰησοῦς*, is used, in the epistle to the Romans, as connected with *κύριος*, only fourteen times; in 1 Corinthians, only eleven. *Ἰησοῦς κύριος* is used in Romans twice; in 1 Corinthians, thrice. *Κύριος Χριστός* only in Rom 16: 18. Such a variety of usage in these different epistles, must, if Schulz's method of arguing is correct, prove that Paul could not have written them all.

(c) Ἰησοῦς, without being connected with the other usual appellations of Christ, is employed in our epistle seven times, viz. 2: 9. 6: 20. 7: 22. 10: 19. 12: 2, 24. 13: 12. In the Pauline epistles, sixteen times, viz. Rom. 3: 26. 8: 11. 1 Cor. 12: 3. 2 Cor. 4: 5. 4: 10 bis. 4: 11 bis. 4: 14. 11: 4. Eph. 4: 21. Phil. 2: 10. 1 Thess. 1: 10. 2: 15. 4: 14 bis. In the epistles to the Galatians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus and Philemon, it is not found at all.

(d) Χριστός is used, in like manner, by our author, six times, viz. 2: 6, 14. 5: 5. 6: 1. 9: 11, 14, 24, 28. 11: 26; in the Pauline epistles one hundred and ninety eight, if I have rightly counted.

(e) Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, instead of being used only twice, as Schulz avers, is used three times; Heb. 10: 10. 13: 8, 21, omitting 3: 1, where it stands also in the *textus receptus*.

(f) In 13: 20, Κύριον Ἰ. Χριστόν is used by the writer, just as Paul employs it.

(g) Those designations of Christ in the Pauline epistles, which Schulz has mentioned as the usual and only appellations of him by Paul, do not collectively amount to more than *sixty eight*, if we take the number as stated by himself, (who, however, as is usual with him, has in haste overlooked some instances); while, in the same epistles, other appellations, which he does *not* acknowledge, are used with far greater frequency; e. g. κύριος is used *one hundred and forty seven times*, and Χριστός, *one hundred and ninety eight*; the former being an appellation which this writer holds out as characteristic of our epistle to the Hebrews, and *neglected* by Paul. Truly this matter is *striking*, (if I may use Dr. Schulz's own language); and if the epistle to the Hebrews can be wrested from Paul, only by arguments such as this, those who ascribe it to this apostle have not much reason for apprehension, in regard to the safety of their cause.

Even if the facts stated by Schulz were correct, it would not follow that Paul could not be the author of our epistle. The predominant appellation of the Saviour in the Pauline epistles is simply Χριστός; as we have just seen. Yet, in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, this appellation, simply used, occurs but once

(3: 5), and in both the epistles to Timothy, and in that to Titus, it does not once occur. Does it follow from this, then, that Paul did not write these epistles? If not, then, supposing the facts alleged by Schulz to be correct, no critical argument could be safely built upon them. But they are so far from being correct, that one finds it difficult to account for it, how any man, who expected others to examine for themselves, and not to receive what he says as *authoritative*, should have thrown out before the public such affirmations as every tyro, with a Greek Concordance in his hand, would be able to disprove. Truly Professor Schulz must not blame his readers, if they are slow and cautious about admitting his allegations, on subjects where accuracy, and diligence, and patience are necessary, in order to produce correct results.

Seyffarth has brought forward the same argument, but with a somewhat different statement of facts; yet full of inaccuracies and errors. He concludes, as the sum of the whole, "that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has given to the Saviour appellations, which are indicative of less reverence than those which Paul bestows upon him," and that "there is a great difference between the usage of Paul, in this respect, and that of our epistle, p. 90."

On the whole, nothing can be plainer, than that the usage in our epistle, with respect to the appellations in question, differs no more from the usual Pauline one, than the usage of several of his acknowledged epistles differs from that of others belonging to him. Consequently, no weight can be attached to this objection.

(20.) 'The writer of our epistle has made use of a great many words and phrases, in order to express ideas which Paul expresses, (either always or usually), by different words or phrases, p. 138 seq.'

This objection is drawn out at great length, and requires a minuteness of consideration and philological exhibition which is truly appalling. But having commenced the work, it must not be left unfinished. The importance of the subject under discussion, is the apology on which I must rely for justification,



as to the length and minuteness of the examination. General assertions may satisfy those who think *in generals*, and reason *in generals*; but the true critic demands *facts*, and of course *detail*, in an investigation dependent on facts.

It will shorten our work, however, and be of no small importance with respect to the satisfaction which the reader's mind is to experience, if some acknowledged, or at least just, principles of reasoning in regard to such a topic, can be premised, before we enter upon particulars.

The following principles seem to be such, as, it may reasonably be expected, will be assented to by all sober and judicious critics; in particular, by all who have not a special end to accomplish by the denial of them.

(a) The same writer, if a man of knowledge and talents, (both of which will be conceded to Paul), does *not*, in an extensive correspondence either on matters of business or sentiment, *always express the same ideas by the same words or phrases*; much less, always repeat the same ideas, whatever may be the nature of the subject which the occasion demands. I appeal to all the volumes of letters extant, in proof of this.

(b) The same writer, at different periods of life, in different circumstances and states of mind and feeling, exhibits a variety of style in his epistles; especially where the subjects themselves are very diverse. The appeal in proof of this, I make to well known facts, and to every one's own experience, who has been long accustomed to write letters on a variety of grave and important topics. In particular will the case be as now represented, if a writer's lot, at one period of his life, be cast among men and authors, who differ in style and modes of thinking and expression, from those with whom he has, at another time, been associated.

(c) It follows, then, that differences in the choice of expression, in two epistles, in order to convey the same idea, (above all when this stands in connexion with diverse subjects), is no good proof that the same person did not, or could not, write both. Indeed, no man who is not a writer of the most sterile genius, and of a mind the most mechanical, nay, absolutely insusceptible

of excitement or of improvement, will always limit himself to the same round of expression. While there will be occasional words and expressions, which will mark some characteristics appropriate to a writer of knowledge and talents, yet in the great body of them, there will not be a mechanical sameness either of thought or of expression; but every letter will take its colouring, more or less, from the occasion and the state of mind which prompted it.

(d) If any person refuses to accede to principles so plain and reasonable as these, it would be easy to shew him, (as will be seen hereafter), that any one of Paul's acknowledged epistles, may be proved to be spurious, on a different ground, just as easily as the epistle to the Hebrews. Schulz and Seyffarth have undertaken to prove, that Paul did not write the epistle to the Hebrews, because it contains many words, either not employed by Paul, or not employed by him in the same sense; and also some favourite expressions, not found in his acknowledged epistles. At first view, the number of such words or expressions, as exhibited by them, seems very great; nay, quite appalling, before examination. Most critics of the present day seem to have been influenced principally by this consideration, in giving up the Pauline origin of our epistle. But a widely extended examination of this subject, has ended in producing different impressions upon my own mind. I am fully persuaded, now, that there is scarcely any one of Paul's *acknowledged* epistles, which cannot be proved to be spurious, if the grounds of argument assumed by the above named writers is tenable. I will pledge myself, (I do not say it at a venture), to produce as many peculiarities, as many *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* or *ἅπαξ λογιζόμενα*, for example, in the epistle to the Romans, in the first to the Corinthians, or in the second to the Corinthians, (in proportion to the length of these epistles, and compared with the other acknowledged epistles of Paul), as there are in the epistle to the Hebrews. If this can be done, then is the argument equally good against either of these epistles, which are among the most undoubted of all the writings of Paul. The proof of this I shall by and by produce, by laying before the reader, the result of the principles which I have ventured to

call in question, by applying them to the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.

(e) Dr. Schulz himself, who has laboured with so much zeal and confidence, to fix upon our epistle the charge of peculiarities in style, expression, and favourite phrases, has, in another part of his work, and before his mind became heated with this subject, made the following remarks, which are well worthy of attention.

“We give up words, and phrases, and thoughts, [in the epistle to the Hebrews], which occur but seldom in the books of the New Testament, or in Paul’s epistles. We shall not insist upon the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* or the *ἅπαξ λογιζόμενα* for why must a writer of numerous works necessarily repeat, oftentimes, his ideas in general, or his favourite phrases? Why must he often do this in *all* his works, and not use some of them merely in particular passages? Every writer will do the latter, and must do it, when, either by accident or by design, he falls only once upon some particular idea. But in regard to a writer, whose whole works we do not possess, (perhaps only a small part of them), how can we pronounce sentence upon many phrases and thoughts, or deduce any argument at all from them? And such is the case before us. What now appears, in the letters of Paul still extant, to be *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον*, he may have said and written numberless times, in works now lost, p. 52.”

He then proceeds very justly to ask, ‘whether it is the design of any New Testament writer, in any one particular book, to represent the whole scheme of Christian doctrine, complete in all its parts? And if not, whether that, which in one book differs from the contents of another, is to be considered as *departure* or *contradiction*, in respect to that other?’ And then he adds, “It is quite surprising, and deserving of reprobation, that any one should call in question expressions against which no objections can be made, when they are consonant with the *usus loquendi*, and are genuine Greek; and also, that any one should produce them as grounds of suspicion against a book, because they do not occur in other compositions of a similar nature. In the epistle to the Hebrews, there are many of this kind, p. 53.”

These remarks are no less just than striking. I freely give

to them my entire and hearty approbation; and I am willing, with such principles in view, to join issue with the author, as to his list of words and phrases which he brings forward, in his attack upon our epistle. Nine parts in ten of all that he has advanced, of this nature, would be excluded from the argument, by his own sentence.

To reduce the view, which I must now give of the words and phrases adduced by Schulz, to as short a compass as will be consistent with my design, I shall first remark on those words which require to be separately discussed; and then, I shall class together those to which some general principle will apply in common. I follow mostly the order of Schulz, step by step, merely because this is more convenient for those, who may wish to compare what is here written with the remarks of this author.

1. Words and phrases, instead of which Paul employs other and different ones.

(1.) ‘*Εὐλάβεια*, Heb. 5: 7. 12: 28, is used in the sense of *piety*, *devotedness to God*; it is equivalent to *εὐσέβεια* as employed by Paul, 1 Tim. 2: 2. 3: 16, etc. Neither of these writers employs the word used by the other, p. 141.’

The sense of *εὐλάβεια*, in Heb. 5: 7, it is altogether probable, is *fear*, which is the *classical* sense of the word; and this is probably the sense, too, in Heb. 12: 28, as its adjunct *αἰδουῖς* seems to indicate. Schulz’s objection is founded on an exegesis far from being certain, and indeed quite improbable. But if we allow his interpretation to be true, the objection amounts only to this, that Paul, at one time, has employed *εὐσέβεια* (the proper Greek word) in order to express the idea of *piety*; and at another time, in writing to the Hebrews, he has used *εὐλάβεια*, (corresponding to the Heb. *פִּיָּאָה* *reverence, piety*), to express the same idea. What could be more natural for a Hebrew, than to do this?

(2.) ‘Our author uses *διαπαντός*’ Paul, *πάντοτε*, and very frequently repeats it, p. 141.’

*Διαπαντός* is common among the Evangelists, and in the Septuagint. Paul uses it in the citation from the Old Testament, in Rom. 11: 10. Paul, then, was familiar with the word. In our epistle, it is found only *twice*, viz. 9: 6. 13: 15. In this same epistle we find the *Pauline* *πάντοτε* also, viz. in 7: 25. Now as to the epistle to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and 2 Timothy, each

has the word *πάντοτε* but *once*; the first epistle to Timothy and that to Titus, not at all. If the fact that *πάντοτε* is used no more than once, is proof that our epistle is not Pauline, then surely these other epistles must be ranked in the same class. The same fact must surely afford the same argument, in both cases. But as this proves more than Schulz is willing to allow, we may suppose he will not insist on such an argument.

(3.) 'Our epistle uses *ἀνακαινίζειν* and *ἐγκαινίξειν* for which Paul employs *ἀνακαινοῦν* and *ἀνανεοῦσθαι*, p. 142.'

*Ἀνακαινίζειν* occurs only once, Heb. 6: 6. *Ἐγκαινίξειν* but twice, Heb. 9: 18. 10: 20. On the other hand, *ἀνακαινοῦν* is found in Paul only twice, 2 Cor. 4: 16. Col. 3: 10; and *ἀνανεοῦσθαι* but once, Eph. 4: 23. Now as *ἀνακαινίζω*, *ἀνακαινόω*, and *ἀνανεόω* are all either of classic or Septuagint usage, and are of the same signification, the use of one or the other, so few times as they are employed in the Pauline epistles and in ours, can afford no argument in favour of a different writer. As to *ἐγκαινίξειν* to consecrate, to initiate, it is a verb of a different meaning from the others, and is not used in the sense in which Paul employs either *ἀνακαινόω* or *ἀνανεόω*.

(4.) 'There is, in our epistle, an abundance of verbs ending in *-ίζω*, such as can be no where else found in the New Testament, above all, in Paul's epistles, p. 142.'

(a) The greater part of the verbs in *-ίζω*, produced by Schulz as appropriate to our epistle, are found often in the New Testament, and in Paul; viz. *λογίζεσθαι*, in other writers of the New Testament 6 times, in Paul 34, in the epistle to the Hebrews but once; *ἐμμανίζειν*, in New Testament, 8, in Hebrews only twice; *καταρτίζειν*, New Testament 5, Paul 5, Hebrews 3; *καθαρίζειν*, New Testament 24, Paul 3, Hebrews 3; *κομίζειν*, New Testament 5, Paul 3, Hebrews 3; *μερίζειν*, New Testament 7, Paul 5, Hebrews 1; *ὀρίζειν*, New Testament 6, Paul 1, Hebrews 1; *ἐγγίζειν*, New Testament 38, Paul 2, Hebrews 2; *χωρίζειν*, New Testament 5, Paul 6, Hebrews 1; *ᾠορίζειν*, New Testament 5, Paul 4, Hebrews 2; *καθίζειν*, New Testament 40, Paul 4, Hebrews 4; *χορηματίζεσθαι*, New Testament 5, Paul 1, Hebrews 3. All these verbs, moreover, are common to the Septuagint and to classic Greek.

(b) Other verbs of this class, adduced by Schulz, are used in our epistle only once; viz. *ἀναλογίζεσθαι*, 12: 3; *ἀνταγωνίζεσθαι*, 12: 4; *καταγωνίζεσθαι*, 11: 33; *θεατορίζειν*, 10: 33; *πριζείν*, 11: 37;

and *τιμπαρίζεσθαι*, 11: 35. The three last are *denominatives*, for which the Greek language offered no other forms; so that no choice, in this case, was left to the writer. All of them are of classic or Septuagint usage.

(c) *Προσοχθίξειν*, Heb. 3: 10, is a quotation from the Septuagint; of which the use of the same word, in 3: 17, is a simple repetition.

It turns out, then, that of the *great multitude* of words in *-ίζω*, *peculiar* to our epistle, only six are employed, exclusively by it; and of these six, three are *denominatives*, and *necessarily* employed, as there was no choice of other forms; while the other three occur but *once* each, and are all compound verbs, common to the Septuagint and to the classics. But Schulz has not ventured to present us with a view of the numerous verbs in *-ίζω*, employed by the New Testament writers and by Paul, which are *not* used at all in our epistle. Selecting only under a single letter, (as a specimen of what might be gathered from the whole), we find the following, *καθοπλίζομαι, καταβιβάζομαι, καταδικάζω, καιακλύζομαι, κατακορημιζω, καταλιθάζω, καιαναθεματιζω, καταποντιζομαι, κατεξουσιάζω, κατεργάζομαι, κατοπιριζομαι, καιηματιζω, καινηριάζομαι κλάζω, καιθαριζω, κλιθωνιζομαι, κολάζομαι, κολαφιζω, κοπάζω, κοιφιζω, κράζω, κραιγάζω, κρισταλλίζω, κτιζω*; *twenty four* under only one letter; which our author, with all his alleged partialities for *-ίζω*, never uses. Surely this is an argument unfortunately chosen, and very incorrectly stated.

(5.) ‘*Ἐντέλλεσθαι* is used in our epistle; Paul uses *παροργελλω, διαιάσσω*, or *ἐπιτάσσω*, p. 145.’

*Ἐντέλλεσθαι* is employed only twice, 9: 20. 11: 22. In the New Testament it is used 15 times, although not employed by Paul. Paul employs *παροργελλω* only in 1 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy; *διαιάσσω* only in 1 Corinthians, Galatians, and Titus; *ἐπιτάσσω* only once in Philemon. Do not these words differ as much from each other, as each of them does from *ἐντέλλεσθαι*: and will not the reasoning be the same, to prove that Galatians and Titus or Philemon are spurious, as that our epistle is? And what shall be said of all those epistles, where none of these words are at all employed?

(6.) ‘Our author employs *καθίζω* in a *neuter* sense, 1: 3. 8: 1. 10: 12. 12: 2; Paul employs this verb in a *transitive* sense, p. 143.’

In the quotation by Paul, 1 Cor. 10: 7, it is used in a *neuter*

sense ; as it is in 2 Thess. 2: 4. It has a transitive sense only in 1 Cor. 6: 4. Eph. 1: 20. It occurs in no other case, in Paul, so that his usage is equally divided. In our epistle, it occurs in the same formula, in all the four instances where it is employed ; and all of these instances refer to Ps. 110: 1, (Sept. 109: 1), where is the like usage of *κάθου*.

(7.) ‘ Abstract appellations of God, such as *θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*, *πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος*, *θρόνος τῆς μεγαλοσύνης*, are unheard of in Paul’s writings, p. 144.’

What then is *πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης*, Rom. 1: 4 ; *θείότης*, 1: 20 ; *ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, *true God*, 1: 25 ; also *ψεῦδος*, *false god*, *ibid.* ; and *πνεῦμα ζωῆς*, 8: 2 ? Is the usage of employing *abstract* words for *concrete ones*, foreign to the style of Paul ? Every one who reads this apostle with attention, will be able to answer this question.

(8.) ‘ Our epistle calls Christ *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*, 1: 3 ; Paul says, *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀοράτου*, 2 Cor. 4: 4. Col. 1: 15, and *μορφή θεοῦ* in Phil. 2: 6, p. 144.’

Is not *μορφή θεοῦ* as different from *εἰκὼν θεοῦ ἀοράτου*, as *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης* is, from the same ? And if this argument prove any thing, does it not prove that the epistle to the Philippians, which employs *μορφή θεοῦ*, (and not *εἰκὼν θεοῦ*), must also be spurious ?

(9.) ‘ In our epistle, *κακουχέω* is used, 11: 37. 13: 3 ; Paul uses *θλίβω* instead of this, p. 145.’

Paul uses *στενοχωρέομαι* three times, in his second epistle to the Corinthians, (and not once any where else), to express the same idea that he elsewhere expresses by *θλίβω*. Is this epistle therefore spurious ?

(10.) ‘ Our epistle employs *ἐνθύμησις* and *ἔννοια*, for which Paul uses *διαλογισμός* and *λογισμός*, p. 145.’

*Λογισμός* is found 2 Cor. 10: 4 ; but *διαλογισμός* in Romans, first Corinthians, Philippians and first Timothy. Is the second Corinthians spurious because it does not use *διαλογισμός* ?

(11.) ‘ Our epistle uses *ἀκλιής*’ for which Paul employs *ἔδραϊος*, *ἀμετακίνητος*, or *μὴ μετακινούμενος*, p. 145.’

*Ἀκλιής* is used once only, Heb. 10: 23. So *ἀμετακίνητος* is used only in 1 Cor. 15: 58, and *μὴ μετακινούμενος* only in Col. 1: 23. Now as in first Corinthians and in Colossians both, Paul uses *ἔδραϊος* as well as these words. in order to express the same idea,

shall the like choice of a synonyme, in another letter, be denied him? And is it reasonable that it should expose his letter to the charge of εpuriousness, because that, out of various synonymes, he has sometimes taken one, and sometimes another?

(12.) ‘Συμπαθεῖν, μετριοπαθεῖν, and παθεῖν are current in our epistle; Paul uses συμπάσχειν and πάσχειν, p. 145.’

Paul uses πάσχειν five times only, in four of which the present tense is required, and of course this form must be used, as there is no present παθεῖω. He also employs ἐπάθειε twice, viz. in Gal. 3: 4. and 1 Thess. 2: 14. Our epistle has this same form, but only three times, 5: 3. 9: 26. 13: 12. Here then are the same forms, in both Paul and our epistle. Besides, are not πάσχω, συμπάσχω, and συμπαθεῖω commingled forms, and every where exchanged for each other? As to μετριοπαθεῖν, it is used but once, Heb. 5: 2, and is there employed in its classical sense.

(13.) ‘In our epistle, we find μετέσχε, κατέσχομεν’ but in Paul, μετέχειν, κατέχειν, p. 145.’

Once only is μετέσχε used, Heb. 2: 14. On the other hand, the Pauline μετέχων is also employed once, in Heb. 5: 13. Besides, in all Paul’s acknowledged epistles, μετέχω occurs only five times, and all of these are in the first epistle to the Corinthians. Is this the only epistle which is genuine?

As to κατέσχομεν, it is found in our epistle only twice, 3: 6. 3: 14; while the alleged Pauline κατέχειν is also used in 10: 43. Besides, are not both of these one and the same verb, in different tenses? And may not the writer of different epistles employ even a different tense of the same verb, when the case demands it, without hazarding the reputation of his letters in respect to genuineness?

(14.) ‘Verbal nouns feminine, particularly such as end in -σις, are unusually frequent in our epistle; and, when put in the accusative by εἰς, they are employed instead of the inf. mode with εἰς τό before it; which latter is the construction that Paul employs, even to excess, and in a manner not consentaneous with Greek idiom, p. 146.’

Paul is no stranger to the employment of nouns in -σις with εἰς before them in the acc., in the sense of the inf. mode with εἰς τό; e. g. Rom. 1: 17. 3: 25. 5: 13. 11: 1. 1 Cor. 11: 24, 25. In regard to other fem. nouns, put in the acc. with εἰς, and used as the inf. with εἰς τό, see Rom. 1: 5, 16. 3: 7. 5: 16. 6: 19, 22. 9: 21 bis, 22, 23. 10: 1. 10. 11: 9. 15: 13. 16: 26. 1 Cor. 1: 9. 2: 7. 5: 5. 10: 31.



16: 15. All these cases have respect to nouns fem. only; very many cases might be added of nouns of the masculine form, employed in the same way. The above instances of the feminine forms are selected from only *two* epistles of Paul. I have found more than forty cases, of the same kind, in his remaining acknowledged epistles.

On the other hand; as to the excessive and unclassical use of the inf. with εἰς τό, by Paul, I do not find it to be as Schulz has stated it. In Romans, I find fifteen cases of infinitives with εἰς τό; in 1 Cor. there are five cases; in 2 Cor. there are four; in Gal. one; in Eph. three; in Phil. four; in Col. not one; in 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Titus and Philemon, not one. But in our epistle, we have the inf. with εἰς τό, in 2: 17. 7: 25. 8: 3. 9: 14, 28. 10: 2 (διὰ τό), 10: 15 (μετὰ τό). 12: 10. 13: 21; i. e. seven cases, just the same as the Pauline ones, and two more (10: 2, 15) of the same nature. If the want of *frequency*, with respect to this construction, proves the spuriousness of our epistle; what does the same thing prove, in respect to the longer epistle, called the first to the Corinthians, which exhibits it only *five* times? And what is to be said of the five epistles named above, which do not at all exhibit this *favourite* construction of Paul?

In regard to the frequency of nouns ending in -σις, the proportion is not greater, than in several of the Pauline epistles; as any one may determine by consulting a Greek Concordance.

(15.) 'Our epistle uses παροξυσμός; Paul ζῆλος, p. 148.'

Παροξυσμός is used only once, Heb. 10: 24, and there not in the sense of ζῆλος.

(16.) 'Our epistle uses πρεσβύτεροι for *ancients*; Paul uses πατέρες, p. 149.'

Paul uses πατέρες, in this way, only in Rom. 9: 5. 11: 28. 15: 8. As to πρεσβύτεροι, it is a common word for אֲנִישֵׁי יָדָא, *ancients*, Matt. 15: 2. Mark 7: 3, 5. also Sept. What should hinder Paul from electing either of these synonyms at his pleasure?

(17.) 'Our author uses προβλέπομαι. Paul uses προετοιμάζω, προουρίζω, προτίθημι. Our author uses ἀντικαθίστημι. Paul ἀνθίστημι, p. 149.'

Προβλέπομαι occurs only in 11: 40, and is synonymous, in some of its meanings, with the other verbs named. Besides, is there not as much departure from *uniformity*, in employing the several words, προετοιμάζω, προουρίζω, προτίθημι, as there is in using προβλέπομαι? And is not ἀντικαθίστημι a classic and Sept. word, and sy-

onymous with ἀνθίστημι? Must a writer never employ but one and the same word?

II. Words employed in the epistle to the Hebrews in a sense different from that in which Paul uses them.

Some of the objections, drawn from words of this class, have already been noticed above.

(18.) ‘Μακροθυμία, μακροθυμεῖν means *patient waiting* or *expectation*, in our epistle; in Paul, it means *lenity towards others*, p. 150.’

Paul employs it in other senses than that of *lenity*. E. g. Col. 1: 11, *patient endurance of evil*; so 2 Tim. 3: 10 prob. 4: 2, see Wahl’s Lex. In the same sense it is probably used, in Heb. 6: 12, 15. But if this be not allowed; it is enough to say that μακροθυμία, in the sense of *patient expectation*, is agreeable to Hellenistic usage. See Job 7: 16 Sept., and James 5: 7, 8.

(19.) ‘Καταλείπεσθαι and ἀπολείπεσθαι are used, by our author, in the sense of *restare, reliquum esse*; they are not so used by Paul, p. 150.’

Καταλείπεσθαι is used, *actively*, in the like sense, in Rom. 11: 4; and this sense is classic and Hellenistic. Ἀπολείπεσθαι is used in the active voice by Paul, in 2 Tim. 4: 13, 20, in a sense as kindred to the use of it in our epistle, (where it is *passive*), as one of these voices can be to the other, in regard to a verb of this nature.

(20.) Ὑπόστασις, in our epistle, has a different sense from that in Paul’s epistles, p. 150.’

I am not able to perceive the difference between ὑπόστασις in 2 Cor. 9: 4. 11: 17, and in Heb. 3: 14. 11: 1. These are all the instances in which this word is employed by Paul or in our epistle, excepting Heb. 1: 3, where the word is used in the classical sense of the later Greek writers. See Wahl’s Lex. on ὑπόστασις.

(21.) Λόγος, in Hebrews, means *word given, assurance, declaration*; in Paul, *doctrine, command, word* in opposition to *deed*, p. 150.’

So in Heb. 13: 7, λόγος means *doctrine*, as also in 5: 13. 6: 1. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. 15: 54, it means *assurance* or *declaration*; as also in Rom. 9: 6, 9. 1 Cor. 4: 19. 2 Cor. 1: 18. 1 Tim. 1: 15. 3: 1. 4: 9. Surely there is no ground for distinction here. In the sense of *account*, too, Paul and our epistle agree; e. g. Rom. 14: 12. Heb. 4: 13. 13: 17.

(22.) ‘*τάξις*, in Hebrews, means *series, succession*; Paul uses it for *good order, arrangement*, p. 150.’

*τάξις*, in the Septuagint, answers to *הַרְבֵּה* *prescribed order or arrangement*, Prov. 29: 24 [31: 26]; to *רָצוּן*, Job 28: 13, Aquila’s translation. In the Sept. Job 24: 5. 36: 23, it has the sense of *prescribed arrangement*. This sense fits, equally well, 1 Cor. 14: 40. Col. 2: 5. and all the cases where it is used in our epistle, viz. 5: 6, 10. 6: 20. 7: 11, 17, 21. all of which are merely the same instance of *τάξις* repeated. But, even if this exegesis be not admitted, still, it is enough to say, that *τάξις* is employed in both the senses named by Schulz, in the Septuagint Greek, and also in classic authors. May not Paul, like any other writer, employ the word, in different parts of his writings, (as he does a multitude of other words), with different shades of meaning?

(23.) ‘*Πλείων* is used by our author in the sense of *praestantior*; by Paul, only for *more*, p. 151.’

In Heb. 3: 3. 7: 23, *πλείων* is used in the sense of *more*; certainly in the last instance. On the other hand, in the sense of *praestantior*, it occurs only once, 11: 4. And this sense is supported both by classic and Septuagint usage.

### III. Favourite expressions, and peculiar phraseology.

Of these, Schulz has collected together a great number; so great, that if they are truly what he names them, they must render the genuineness of our epistle *suspected*, to every critical reader. But whether he has rightly attributed to these words and expressions the characteristics which he gives them, remains to be examined.

(24.) ‘The use of *γάρο*, in our epistle, is excessive; so much so, that a translator, if he means to avoid misleading his readers, must often pass it over unnoticed. Paul is less frequent in the use of this particle; and employs it only in cases where it has a meaning, p. 152.’

In the New Testament before me, the epistle of Paul to the Romans occupies fourteen pages; that to the Hebrews, ten. In Romans, I find *γάρο* one hundred and forty five times, i. e. on an average, more than ten to a page; in our epistle, I find it ninety one times, i. e. on an average, a little more than nine to a page. So much for this *favourite* particle of the author of our epistle.

(25.) ‘The words, *προσφέρειν* and *προσφορά*, are used times

almost without number, in our epistle, in respect to Christ's offering up himself before God, by means of his death; Paul does not use the verb at all, nor the noun but once, Eph. 5: 2, in this sense, p. 153.'

These words are employed in respect to the offering by Christ, in Heb. 9: 14, 25, 28. 10: 10, 12, 14, *six* instances; which, considering the nature of the comparison between Christ's death and the Jewish offerings, is rather to be wondered at for *unfrequent*, than for frequent occurrence. But is it not truly surprising, that Schulz should produce, as examples which have respect to the *offering* made by the *death of Christ*, προσφέρειν and προσφορά, in Heb. 5: 1, 3, 7. 8: 3, 4. 9: 7, 9. 10: 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 18. 11: 4, 17. 12: 7? all of which refer to *Jewish* offerings, excepting 12: 7, which has wholly another sense. Nor is the language of our epistle limited to προσφέρειν, and προσφορά. The writer uses αναφέρειν, in 7: 27 bis, 9: 28. 13: 15; which is also used by other New Testament writers, e. g. James 2: 21. 1 Pet. 2: 5, 24. As to the *frequency* with which προσφορά is used, it is found only in five instances; two of these (10: 5, 8) are quotations from the Old Testament; and the other three, (10: 10, 14, 18), are all plainly occasioned by the quotations just named, as they are employed in reasoning upon it. No where else, in our epistle, does the writer use this word; but he employs θυσία no less than fifteen times, which word Paul has also employed five times. Considering the nature of the discussion in our epistle, is there any ground for the objection made by Schulz?

(26.) 'Ἐγγιζειν τῷ θεῷ, and προσερχεσθαι τῷ θεῷ are frequent forms in our epistle; but not so in Paul, p. 153.'

The first of these phrases occurs only once, 7: 19. The *frequency* of it, therefore, should not have been alleged. But the same verb as applied to *time*, is used in Heb. 10: 25 and in Rom. 13: 12. That ἐγγιζειν τῷ θεῷ was a usual form of Hebrew Greek, is evident from James 4: 8.

In respect to προσερχεσθαι, it is nearly a synonyme with ἐγγιζειν, and is used a great number of times in the New Testament, and by Paul in 1 Tim. 6: 3, but in the figurative sense of *attending to, giving heed to*. The use of it in our epistle. (it is employed seven times), is occasioned by its correspondence with the Hebrew בִּירְרָה, which describes *the action of approaching God with an offering*: an idea which, from the nature of the comparisons instituted, must of necessity frequently occur.

(27.) 'Such forms as λαμβάνειν πείραν—μισθαποδοσίαν—

ἀογὴν—τιμὴν—νεκρούς—ἐπαγγελίαν—ἐπαγγελίας, are frequent, and peculiar to our epistle, p. 153.

In Paul, too, we have, λαμβάνειν χάριν—ἀποστολήν—σημείον—καταλλαγὴν—περισσεΐαν—σφοδρότην—πνεῦμα—δουλείας—πνεῦμα νόθεσις—κρίμα—πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου—μισθόν—βραβεῖον—στέφανον—ἄρτον—οἰκοδομήν—ὑπόνοιον—ὑμᾶς—πρόσωπον—ἐπαγγελίαν—μορογὴν—ἐντολήν—ὑπόμνησιν. Is not this equally peculiar?

(28.) ‘ Διαθήκη, and the compounds and derivatives of *τιθέναι* are unusually frequent in our epistle, p. 154.’

*Διαθήκη* is employed by Paul, nine times; but in our epistle, where the nature of the comparison lies between the old covenant and the new, the more frequent use of this word was altogether to be expected. Out of the seventeen instances, however, in which our author uses it, six are quoted from the Old Testament, viz. 8: 8, 9 bis, 10. 9: 20. 10: 16; and three more are in phrases transferred from the Old Testament, viz. 9: 4 bis. 10: 29; so that eight instances only belong properly to our author’s style. Could a less number than this be rationally expected, considering the nature of the discussion?

As to the uncommonly frequent use of the compounds and derivatives of *τίθημι*, in our epistle, the following is the result of comparison. *Διατίθημι*, four times in Hebrews, two of which are in quotations, viz. 8: 10. 10: 16. In the other two cases, the word is employed in a sense different from the one usual in the New Testament, viz. 9: 16, 17. *Μεταίθεσις* is one of the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* of our epistle; (see on these § 29). *Μετατίθημι* is used three times; also in Gal. 1. 6; *ἀθετεῖν*, Hebrews once, Paul six times; *αθέτησις*, Hebrews twice; *νομοθετεῖν*, Hebrews twice, (*νομοθεσία* in Rom. 9: 4); *ἐπίθεσις*, Hebrews once, Paul twice; *πρόθεσις*, Hebrews once, Paul six times; *ἀποτίθημι*, Hebrews once, Paul four times. Can the position of Schulz be supported, when the result of investigation turns out thus?

(29.) ‘ *Τελειοῦν*, to bring to perfection, to advance to the highest mark, is a favourite expression of our epistle, p. 154.’

It is so employed in 2: 10. 5: 9. 7: 28. 12: 23. but in a different acceptation, in 7: 19. 9: 9. 10: 1, 14. 11: 40, perhaps the last instance belongs to the other category. To the former, alleged peculiar sense of *τελειόω*, Paul is no stranger, Phil. 3: 12. comp. 2 Cor. 12: 9. Other Hellenists, also, employ it in the same manner;

Luke 13: 32. The derivate forms, *τελείωσις* and *τελειότης*, 7: 11. 12: 2, occur once only in this epistle. *Τελείωσις*, also in Luke 1: 45.

(30.) ‘*Κρείττων* is employed frequently, by our author, in a sense altogether peculiar, viz. in the sense of *more excellent*, p. 154.’

In the same sense Paul uses it, 1 Cor. 12: 31; a sense, moreover, which is common to classic and Hellenistic usage.

(31.) ‘*Αιώνιος* is unusually frequent; e. g. *αἰώνιος σωτηρία—κρίμα—πνεῦμα—λύτρωσις—ζηλονομία—διαθήκη*, etc. p. 154.’

But Paul uses *αἰώνιος ζωή—χρόνος—θεός—βάρος—αἰώνια βλεπόμενα—αἰώνιος ὄλεθρος—παρακλήσις—κράτος—δόξη*. Paul uses the word twenty four times; our epistle only six.

(32.) ‘*Ζωή* and *ζῆν* are used very frequently, by our author, to denote *perpetuity, lasting continuance*, p. 155.’

So they are by Paul; e. g. Rom. 9: 26. 2 Cor. 3: 3. 6: 16. 1 Thess. 1: 9. 1 Tim. 3: 15. 4: 10; and this sense is frequent in the New Testament.

(33.) ‘The frequent use of *πᾶς* in the *singular*, in our epistle, is striking, p. 155.’

Our epistle makes ten pages in the edition of the New Testament lying before me; and I find *πᾶς*, in the singular, sixteen times in it, i. e. on an average, about once and a half to each page. The epistle to the Ephesians makes four and a half pages, and I find the same *πᾶς* in it twenty three times, i. e. on an average more than five times to each page. So much for the *strikingly frequent* use of *πᾶς* in our epistle!

(34.) ‘The words *ὄθεν, χωρίς, ἴδιον*, and *ἀδύνατον* are unusually frequent in our epistle, p. 155.’

*ὄθεν* is not used in the acknowledged epistles of Paul, (see in respect to *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*, § 29); but in the New Testament it is common. *Χωρίς* Paul uses fifteen times. *ἴδιον* is peculiar to Hebrews, and occurs thrice. *Ἀδύνατον* is employed four times in our epistle, twice by Paul, and four times by the other writers of the New Testament.

(35.) ‘Compounds of words with *εἶ*, are *favourite* forms with our author, p. 155.’

The following results will shew how far this is well founded. *Εὐθεῖος* occurs in Hebrews *once*: *εὐθύτης*, once; *εὐάροστον*, Hebrews 1, Paul 3; *εὐαρεσιῶ*, Hebrews 3; *εὐαρεσιῶς*, Hebrews 1;

εὐλάβεια, Hebrews 2; εὐλαβέουμαι, Hebrews 1; εὐποιᾶ, Hebrews 1; εὐπερίσιτος, Hebrews 1; εὐλογία, Hebrews 2, Paul 9; εὐλογεῖν, Hebrews 6, Paul 8; εὐκαιρος, Hebrews 1; εὐδοκεῖν, Hebrews 3, Paul 11.

On the other hand, compare the compounds of this sort in Paul, which do not occur in our epistle; viz. εὐγενής, εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελιστής, εὐδοκία, εὐεργεσία, εὐθέως, εὐκαιρῶ, εὐκαιρῶς, εὐλογητός, εὐνοια, εὐμειάδοτος, εὐδοῦμαι, εὐπρόσδεκτος, εὐπρόσδεθος, εὐπροσωπῶ, εὐσέβεια, εὐσεβεῖν, εὐσεβῶς, εὐσημος, εὐσπλαγχνος, εὐσχημόνως, εὐσχημόνη, εὐσχήμων, εὐτραπελία, εὐφημία, εὐφημος, εὐφραίνω, εὐχαριστέω, εὐχαριστία, εὐχάριστος, εὐχρηστος, εὐψυχῶ, εὐωδία. Can there be any foundation, now, for the assertion of Schulz?

(36.) 'Compounds with ἀνά are unusually frequent, in our author, p. 156.'

The fact stands thus. Once only are ἀναδέχομαι, ἀναθεωρέω, ἀνακαινίζω, ἀνάγω, ἀνακάμπω, ἀναλογίζομαι, ἀνασταυρόω, ἀνατέλλω, used in our epistle. Ἀναφέρω is employed four times. In Paul, on the other hand, we find, ἀναβαίνω 7, ἀναγγέλλω 2, ἀνασπινώσκω 8, ἀνάγνωσις 2, ἀνάγω 1, ἀναζάω 2, ἀναζωπυρῶ 1, ἀναθάλλω 1, ἀνάθεμα 5, ἀνακαίνωσις 2, ἀνακαινός 1, ἀνακαλύπτω 2, ἀνακεφαλαίωμαι 2, ἀνακόπτω 2, ἀνακρίνω 10, ἀναλαμβάνω 4, ἀνάλυσις 1, ἀναλύω 1, ἀναλίσκω 1, ἀναλογία 1, ἀναμένος 1, ἀνανεώω 1, ἀνανήγω 1; ἀνάξιτος 1, ἀναξίως 2, ἀναπαύω 4, ἀναπέμπω 1, ἀναπολόγητος 2, ἀναπληρώω 5, ἀνασπαιτόω 1, ἀναιθῆμι 1, ἀνατρέπω 2, ἀναψύχω 1; all of which are wanting in the epistle to the Hebrews. Is there any want of frequency, in compounds of this sort, in the writings of Paul? Rather is there not even a want of frequency, with respect to words of this class, in our epistle?

(37.) 'Good periods, with comparisons by ὅσον—τοσοῦτο, with εἰ γάρ—πῶς δέ, with καθώς, etc. are not so frequent in Paul's writings as here, p. 156.'

In what other epistle, has Paul had so frequent occasion for comparisons?

(38.) 'Σωτηρία, in the sense of *Christian happiness*, is peculiar to our epistle. Ἀντιλογία is also peculiar, p. 156.'

(a) Our epistle does not limit the word σωτηρία to such a sense. It is employed in its usual acceptance, in 2: 10. 11: 7, and probably in 5: 9. 6: 9. 9: 28. On the other hand, Paul uses σωτηρία for *Christian happiness*, Rom. 10: 1, 10. 11: 11. Eph. 1: 13. 1 Thess.

5: 8, 9. 2 Thess. 2: 13. 2 Tim. 3: 15. (b) As to ἀντιλογία, it is not found, it is true, in Paul's acknowledged epistles; but it is in Jude v. 11; and the verb ἀντιλέγω, is in Rom. 10: 21. Tit. 1: 9. 2: 9.

(39) 'Μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρεῖσθαι, in the sense of bearing honorary testimony, are peculiar to our epistle, p. 156.'

They are not. See Rom. 10: 2. 1 Tim. 5: 10; and often in the gospels, as may be seen in any of the New Testament lexicons.

(40.) 'The following habitual expressions, so often employed by Paul, are wanting in our epistle; viz. οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν—θέλω ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι—τοῦτο δέ γημι—γνωρίζω (γνωρίζομεν) δὲ ὑμῖν—οἶδα γάρ—οἶδαμεν δέ etc.—γινώσκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι—τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν—ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις—ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι—ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε—μὴ γένοιτο—τί οὖν—τί γάρ—ἄρα οὖν—μενοῦνγε, p. 157 seq.'

If the want of these forms of expression in our epistle proves it to be spurious, then the same argument must prove a great part of Paul's epistles to be so. E. g. οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν is not in Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon. *Favourite* as Schulz represents this phrase to be, it is found only in Romans twice, 1 Corinthians twice; and in 2 Corinthians, οὐ γάρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν once.

Θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι is once in 1 Cor. 11: 3. and wanting in all the other Pauline epistles; an expression, therefore, *singularly* favourite.

Τοῦτο δέ γημι is in 1 Corinthians twice, and wanting in all the rest of Paul's works.

Γνωρίζω (γνωρίζομεν) δὲ ὑμῖν, Paul uses four times. The verb is employed some twenty times, in all his epistles, but not in the formula mentioned by Schulz.

Οἶδα, οἶδαμεν, etc. is used often by Paul, indeed unusually so; in our epistle less frequently. In 10: 30 we have οἶδαμεν, and five other cases of derivatives from εἶδω or εἰδέω occur.

Γινώσκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, occurs only in Phil. 1: 12.

Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, in Romans six times, and no where else. Which then is spurious, the epistle to the Romans, or all the others?

Ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι, only twice, Rom. 9: 19. 11: 19.

Ἐρεῖ τις, only once, 1 Cor. 15: 37.

ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε, only twice, Rom. 6: 3. 7: 1.

Μὴ γένοιτο, only in Galatians and Romans.



*Τὶ γὰρ*, not in Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, first Thessalonians, second Thessalonians, first Timothy, second Timothy, Titus.

*Τὶ οὖν*, not in any of Paul's epistles, except Romans, first Corinthians and Galatians.

*Ἄρα οὖν*, only in the epistle to the Romans, Galatians once, Ephesians once, first Thessalonians once, second Thessalonians once.

*Ἄρα* is used by our author too, 4: 9. 12: 8.

*Μενοῦνγε*, in Romans, Philippians; but no where else in Paul's epistles.

Certain is it, then, that the same argument which would prove the spuriousness of our epistle, would also prove the spuriousness of more or less of Paul's acknowledged epistles; for there is not a single phrase mentioned by Schulz, in all his list of "favourite expressions often repeated by Paul," which is not wanting in more or less of his acknowledged epistles. The words *οἶδα, οἶδαμεν*, etc. only, are to be excepted. Many of these *favouritisms* we see, too, upon examination, turn out to belong only to some *single* epistle; e. g. *θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι, τοῦτο δὲ φημι, γινώσκειν ὅτι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι, ἐρεῖ τις*, and *ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε*. It is difficult to conceive how a man of Schulz's intelligence, could willingly risk the hazard of such arguments as these.

I have omitted no argument of a philological nature, which Dr. Schulz has brought forward, excepting a few *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, of which I shall hereafter take notice. If the reader hesitates in regard to the sufficiency of some parts of the answers to Schulz, which I have laid before him, I request him to suspend his decision, until he shall have read through the sequel; in which the general method of argument used by Schulz and Seyffarth, will be the subject of further observation. Before I proceed to this, however, the allegations of Seyffarth, (in cases wherein they differ from those of Schulz, and from those made by Bertholdt and others, which have already been examined), must be considered. I do not aim at writing a *regular review* of Seyffarth's whole book; but merely to pass in review such arguments of his, as have not already been examined, omitting only those, on which it cannot well be supposed, that he placed any important reliance.

§ 28. *Objections of Seyffarth examined.*

I shall first examine the objections drawn from the alleged "peculiarity of the matters treated of," in our epistle.

(1.) ' Paul concerns himself only with those churches which he himself established. He was not the founder of any church purely Hebrew. The person who, in our epistle, addresses the Hebrews, must have sustained a relation to them very different from that which Paul sustained, § 47.'

Is any thing plainer, however, through the whole epistle, than the fact, that the writer of it was not a founder or bishop of the church whom he addresses? Not a hint of either of these relations is discoverable. The circumstances, then, agree altogether with the condition of Paul, who did not found or preside over the Hebrew churches.

But the assumption, that Paul never concerned himself with any churches of which he was not himself the founder, is manifestly erroneous. Did not this apostle write his epistle to the Romans, before he ever saw Rome? See Rom. 1: 13. 15: 24. Are not the expressions, in this epistle, as affectionate and as authoritative, to say the least, as in the epistle to the Hebrews? Paul, surely, had a very deep sympathy and tender concern for his Jewish brethren. See Rom. 9: 1 seq. 10: 1 seq. 11: 1 seq. Compare, for expressions of kindness, Heb. 6: 10 seq. 10: 32 seq., in particular v. 34, if the reading *δεσμοῖς μου* be adopted; and Titmann, in his recent edition of the New Testament, has adopted it.

(2.) ' Paul no where treats formally of the dignity of Jesus; nor does he any where employ such arguments as our epistle exhibits, against defection from Christianity, p. 101.'

Paul no where else treats of the resurrection, in such a manner as the 1 Cor. xv. does; nor of many other subjects, discussed in that epistle; does it follow, that Paul did not write the first epistle to the Corinthians, because it has these *peculiarities*? Besides, the fact is not correctly stated by Seyffarth. Surely Rom. 9: 5. Eph. 1: 20—23. Phil. 2: 6—11. Col. 1: 13—19.

contain something about the dignity of Christ; not to mention many other passages. That the apostle has no where, except in our epistle, entered into a formal comparison of Christ with others, is true; but it is enough to say, that no where else did the occasion demand it.

(3.) ‘Paul every where inveighs against Jewish opinions; urges justification *χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου*, and *ἐκ πίστεως*; dwells on the glorious advent of the Messiah; and urges the equal right of the Gentiles to the blessings of the Christian religion. Not a word of all this, in the epistle to the Hebrews, p. 105.’

And where is there any thing of all this, in the first epistle to the Corinthians? Must a writer always speak of the very same subjects, and in the same way? And if he does not, but speaks *pro re nata*, is it any just ground of suspicion, that such of his letters as are not exactly like certain other ones, cannot be genuine?

(4.) ‘It is wonderful, that our epistle should represent the devil as the cause of death, 2: 14; Paul knows nothing of such a cause, see 2 Tim. 1: 10. 1 Cor. 15: 55, p. 106.’

This objection is built on an exegesis of Heb. 2: 14, which cannot be supported; see the Commentary on this passage. But if the exegesis were correct, it would not follow, that the apostle might not, in one passage, express a sentiment which he has no where else expressed. See, for example, 1 Cor. 15: 22—28. After all, it is not true, that Paul does not recognise Satan as the author of the condemning sentence which Adam incurred; see 1 Tim. 2: 13, 14. 2 Cor. 11: 3, comp. with Rom. 5: 12 seq.

(5.) ‘Paul, when he writes to any church, enters into a particular consideration of all their wants, and woes, and dangers; e. g. in his epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, p. 107. seq.’

And does Paul any where shew a deeper sympathy for those whom he addresses, than the writer of our epistle exhibits? Must every epistle which a man writes, be *de omni scibili*, or *de omni re possibili*? As Paul was not bishop of the church whom he addresses in our epistle, it was not to be expected that he would use the same degree of freedom, in all respects, which he

uses in some others of his epistles. Particularly, may we well suppose, that he would be sparing in localities and personalities, if his epistle was designed to be *encyclical*; as we have good reason to believe it was.

(6.) ‘Our epistle every where urges to *τελειότητα*; not so Paul. With our author, too, the sonship of Christ is the great *τελειότης* of religion; not so in Paul. See 1 Cor. 3: 11, where it is reckoned as the *foundation*. Where too has Paul compared Christ to the angels? p. 110.’

That Paul does not urge forward those whom he addresses, to a higher degree of Christian knowledge and virtue, is an allegation which I believe to be *novel*, and which needs to be met only when something is brought forward to substantiate it. As to the doctrine of Christ’s *Souship* being reckoned as the *foundation* of Christianity, I find nothing of it in 1 Cor. 3: 11, where Christ, in his mediatorial person or character simply, is presented. That Paul’s acknowledged epistles have not run a parallel between Christ and the angels, is true enough; but how are we to shew that Paul never could do this in one epistle, because he has not done it in another?

(7.) ‘There is more pure and continuous argument, in our epistle, than in those of Paul.’

There is more pure and continuous argument in the epistle to the Romans, than there is in the epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians; but is this any proof, that Paul did not write the latter epistles? And must the tenor of all the epistles which any man writes, however diverse the occasion and the subject may be, always be one and the same?

(8.) ‘Paul cites the Old Testament with great freedom, at one time following the Septuagint, and at another, the Hebrew. Our author keeps close to the Septuagint.’

The case is too strongly stated. It is not exactly correct, in either respect. But if it were, it does not follow, that in writing to those who had the Greek Scriptures in their own hands, and were habitually conversant with them, Paul would not keep closer than usual to the words of the ancient oracles. It is altogether natural that he should do so.

## I. Objections drawn from peculiar phrases.

(9.) ‘The following phrases are *sui generis*, and *maxime peculiare*, in our epistle ; viz. διαφωρότερον ὄνομα κληρονομεῖν, εἶναι εἰς πατέρα, δόξη στεφανοῦν, πεποιθότα εἶναι, ἀρχὴν λαμβάνειν λαλήσαι, ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας, μαρτύριον τῶν λελαλημένων, παρρησία τῆς ἐλπίδος, στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ, δι᾽ ἐκνεῖσθαι ἀκρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, προσέροχεσθαι θρόνῳ χάριτος, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνεσθαι, περικεῖσθαι ἀμαρτίαν, ἀφίεναι τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς λόγον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φέρεσθαι, γέυσασθαι δωρεᾶς ἐπουρανίου, μιμηταὶ τῶν διὰ πίστεως κληρονομοῦντων, ἄγκυρα ἐλπίδος, προκειμένη ἐλπίς, ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, ἐντολὴ ἀποδεκατοῦν, μετατιθεμένη ἱεροσόνη, ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν, δικαιοῦματα λατρείας, περισκεκαλυμμένος χρυσίον, σιάσιν ἔχειν, πάνεσθαι προσφερομένην, διδάχαι ξέναι, and θυσία αἰνέσεως, p. 83.’

Admitting, now, that the same phraseology cannot be found in Paul’s epistles ; is not the Greek of these phrases classic or Hellenistic ? Is it not such as a writer might choose, without any uncommon peculiarities ? But without insisting on this, I have only to remark, at present, that the same kind of argument which Seyffarth adduces, if it be valid, will prove any one of Paul’s epistles to be spurious, with equal force. I must refer the reader, for the illustration and proof of this, to § 29 in the sequel.

## II. Objections from the peculiar forms and juncture of words, in our epistle.

(10.) ‘Our author makes a peculiarly frequent use of composite words. His epistle contains five hundred and thirty four words of this sort ; while Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, uses only four hundred and seventy eight, p. 91.’

Without following on, in the steps of Seyffarth, to examine whether his enumeration is correct, I take it as he has presented it. I open my New Testament at the epistle to the Colossians accidentally, and proceed to count the *composite* words ; which amount, if I have made no mistakes, to one hundred and seventy eight ; the number of pages is three. The epistle, then, averages fifty nine composite words to a page. The epistle to the Hebrews, occupies ten pages, and has, according to Seyffarth, five hundred

and thirty four composite words, i. e. on an average, fifty three to a page. If it is spurious for this reason, *a fortiori* the epistle to the Colossians must be counted spurious also.

(11.) ‘Our author is partial to the use of participles, and of the genitive absolute. He employs eighty four active participles, and one hundred and seven passive and middle ones, and seven cases of the genitive absolute; while in the epistle to the Romans, there are only ninety active participles, and forty two passive, and no cases of the genitive absolute, p. 81.’

Allowing the enumeration of Seyffarth to be correct, the average number of participles, on each page, will be for Hebrews, nineteen; for Romans, ten. Put now this principle to the test, in some other epistles. If I have rightly counted, the epistle to the Colossians has active participles thirty four, passive forty, pages three, average number of participles to a page, twenty four. Ephesians has active participles sixty, passive twenty four, pages four and a half, average to a page, twenty three. Of course, if our epistle is spurious, because it employs so many as nineteen participles to each page, then these epistles must be spurious, which employ twenty three or twenty four to a page.

And as to the genitive *absolute*, the second Corinthians, (which has active participles ninety seven, passive seventy seven, pages nine, average to a page, nineteen, the same as in our epistle), has the genitive absolute three times. Can any thing be more inconclusive, now, than such a species of reasoning?

(12.) ‘Our author has peculiar junctures of words; e. g. ἔσχατον ἡμέρων, τὸ ἀμετάβειτον τῆς βοιολῆς, κοιρανέω with the genitive, διαγορώτερος παρά, εἶναι πρὸς τινα, ἀιάσι, σις τῶν νεκρῶν, παθήματα θανάτων, ἀγαγεῖν εἰς δόξαν, κρατῆσαι with the accusative, ἐν γηελίξω with the accusative, ἀδύνατον with the infinitive after it, αἱ πρότερον ἡμέραι, καταβάλλειν θεμελίων, p. 81.’

Some of these phrases are Pauline; e. g. ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, Rom. 1: 4. 15: 12, 21, 24. Phil. 3: 11. So ἐν ἀγγελίξω with the accusative, Rom. 10: 5 bis, 2 Cor. 11: 7. Gal. 1: 9. In regard to the others, if they prove any thing, they will prove too much; for the same kind of argument would show, (as we shall hereafter see), that the first epistle to the Corinthians is spurious. The phrases in question are all either classic or Alexandrine Greek;

and how can it be shewn, then, that it was either impossible or improbable, that Paul should employ them?

III. Objections drawn from the use of words employed, in our epistle, in a sense different from that which Paul attaches to them.

(13.) ‘*Υἱὸς θεοῦ*, in our epistle, designates the higher nature of Christ, and not the Messiah simply. In Paul, it has the latter sense, p. 60 seq.’

Paul also uses it in the former sense, in Rom. 1: 3, 4. 8: 3, 32, and probably in 2 Cor. 1: 19. In our epistle, it is used in the sense, alleged by Seyffarth to be the exclusive one, only in 1: 2 and perhaps 7: 3. In other cases, it is employed in the usual sense of *Messiah*; viz. in 1: 5 bis, 8. 4: 14. 5: 5, 8. 6: 6. 7: 28. 10: 29.

(14.) ‘*Κληρονόμος*, *lord, possessor*, is peculiar to our epistle, p. 63.’

Not so. In Rom. 4: 13, 14. 8: 17. Gal. 3: 29. 4: 7. Tit. 3: 7, it is used in the same way. Indeed, the usage of *κληρονόμος*, in this sense, is *Pauline*, instead of *antipauline*.

(15.) ‘Our author uses *ὑπόστασις* in the sense of *fundamentum*, Heb. 1: 3; Paul no where employs it in such a sense, p. 66.’

In Heb. 1: 3, *ὑπόστασις* is *unique*. In 3: 14. 11: 1, *ὑπόστασις* means *confidence*; so in Paul, 2 Cor. 9: 4. 11: 17.

(16.) ‘*Ἔργον*, in the sense of *beneficence*, Heb. 6: 10, is peculiar to our epistle, p. 76.’

The meaning attributed to *ἔργον* here, is deduced merely from the context, viz. from *ἀγάπης* which follows it. The sense of *ἔργον* itself here does not differ from that which it has, in Eph. 2: 10. Col. 1: 10. Tit. 2: 14, specially 2 Cor. 9: 8. 1 Tim. 6: 18. So also in Matt. 26: 10. Acts 9: 36.

(17.) ‘*Πηλίκος* in our epistle, 7: 4, means *quam insignis, how distinguished*; Paul applies it only to *magnitude*, Gal. 6, 11, p. 77.’

These two instances are the only ones, in which *πηλίκος* occurs in the New Testament. *Πηλίκος* properly signifies, *of what magnitude*. It may be applied either in a *physical* or *mor-*

*al* sense. In Gal. 6: 11, it is applied in the former sense, (so also in the Septuagint, Zach. 2: 2); in Heb. 7: 4, it is used in the latter sense; at least, it designates *greatness of rank* or *condition*. Can any thing be more natural than the derivation of this *secondary* sense of the word, in such a case, from the primary one?

(18.) ‘*Οἶκος*, Heb. 8: 8, 10, is used in the sense of *tota gens*; Paul does not employ it in this sense, p. 77.’

It is sufficient to reply, that both of these instances are not our author’s own words; they are quotations from the Septuagint. As to the writer’s own use of *οἶκος*, he employs it in the usual sense, viz, *household*. See Heb. 3: 2—6. 10: 21. 11: 7, and comp. 1 Cor. 1: 16. 1 Tim. 3: 4, 5, 12, 15. 5: 4. 2 Tim. 1: 16. 4: 19 etc; also Acts 7: 10. 10: 2 etc.

(19.) ‘*Ἐπισυνεγωγή* is peculiar to our epistle, p. 77.’

It is employed but once, Heb. 10: 25. Only once more is it found in all the New Testament, and that is in 2 Thess. 2: 1, in a sense like that in Heb. 10: 25. If any thing can be fairly deduced from this, it is in favour of the Pauline origin of our epistle.

(20.) ‘*Κοσμικόν*, in the sense of *exornatum*, Heb. 9: 1, is peculiar. Paul uses *κόσμιος* and *κεκοσμημένος*, p. 78.’

The exegesis of this word is manifestly erroneous. See Heb. 9: 11, 24. 12: 22. Rev. 21: 2.

(21.) ‘*Περικαλύπτω* is used, Heb. 9: 4, to express the *covering* of vessels; in 1 Tim. 2: 9, for the *veiling* of women, p. 79.’

*Περικαλύπτω*, is not used in 1 Tim. 2: 9, nor any where in Paul’s acknowledged epistles. It is used only in Mark 14: 65. Luke 22: 64; and there, in the same sense as in Heb. 9: 4.

(22.) ‘*Συνείδησις* is used, in our epistle, in the sense of *animus, mens*; by Paul, in the sense of *conscience*, p. 79.’

So is it used in the sense of *conscience*, too, by our author, in 13: 18, and probably 10: 22. In 10: 2, it means *consciousness*. Only in Heb. 9: 9, 14, has it the sense of *mens, animus*; which also it seems to have, in 2 Cor. 5: 11.

(23.) ‘*Ἀναιρέω* is used in the sense of *abolishing*, Heb. 10: 9; Paul uses *καταργέω*, p. 80.’



*Ἀναιρέω* is used but once; and then, in a sense which is common in the Septuagint and in classic authors. *Καταργέω* is also employed by our author, Heb. 2: 14, and in the same sense in which Paul employs it; which sense is exclusively Pauline. Comp. Luke 13: 7.

In regard to the words *αἰών*, *τάξεις*, and *ἡγούμενοι*, on which Seyffarth also charges peculiarity of signification, in our epistle, they have been already examined above. See pp. 104. 225. 182.

IV. Ἕπαξ λεγόμενα of our epistle.

Nearly one half of Seyffarth's Essay is occupied with reckoning up words of this class, §§. 16—28. It is singular, that he should bring into this computation words that occur in the quotations made from the Septuagint; e. g. *ἐλίσειν*, *παραπικρασμός*, *προσοχθίξει*, *τροχιά*, *ὄρθος*, etc.; as if these were chargeable, as peculiarities, upon the idiom of our epistle. Yet such is the ardour with which arguments of this nature have been urged by him, Schulz, and others, that the bounds of sober reflection are not unfrequently overleaped, and objections undistinguishingly pressed into service, by these writers.

I subjoin a catalogue of these Ἕπαξ λεγόμενα, because I wish to put the reader in possession of all that is adduced, to overthrow the Pauline origin of our epistle. The force of the argument, I shall examine in a subsequent section.

I remark here only, that I find, by actual examination, this whole class of so called Ἕπαξ λεγόμενα, (almost without exception), are words both of classical and of Septuagint or Alexandrine usage. The employment, therefore, of words belonging to both these kinds of Greek, can mark nothing very peculiar in the style or choice of words adopted by our author. The instances alleged by Seyffarth are the following; viz.

Chap. I. Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, ἀπαύγασμα, χαρακτήρ, μεγαλωσύνη, ἐλίσειν.\* II. Παραρρέειν, μεθασποδοσία, στυπλιμαρτυρέω, βραχύ, παραπλησίως, ἰλάσκεσθαι. III. Διέτοχος, θεραπεύω, παραπικρασμός,\* προσοχθίζω.\* IV. Ὑπόδειγμα, ἀφανής, τραχηλίξω, βοήθεια, εὐκαιρός. V. Μειριοπαθεῖν, ἰκειηρῶν, αἰτιος, προσαρρορευθεῖς, νοθρός, αἰσθητήρια, ἔξις. VI. Παραδειγματί-

ζω, βοιάνη. ἐπιτηγάνω governing the genitive, ἀντιλογία, ἀμετάθετος. VII. Κοπή, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, ἀφωμοιομήνος, διηνεκές, ἀκροθίτια, πατριάρχης, ἰερατεία, σπυριτάω, ἀθέτησις, ἀπαράβατος, παρτελής, ἀμίαντος. VIII. Ἐπήξε, ὄψια, ἀαγέρω, χρηματίζω, νομοθετεῖν, διατιθέναι, ἰλεως εἶναι\*, παλαιούν, ἀφανισμός. IX. Ἐγκαινίζομαι, ἑαντίζω, αἰματεκχυσία, ἀντίτυπος, συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων. X. Ἀνότερον, πρόσφατος, ἀκλινής, παροξυσμός, ἐκουσίως, γόβερτος, ἐνυβρίζειν, ἄθλησις, θεαρίζειν, ὀνειδισμός, χρονίζειν. XI. Ἐναρσετεῖν, ἄστρα, ἀναρίθμητος, παρεπίδημος, τρίμηνον, ἀστειός, διάλυγμα, σιγκακονχεῖν, κατάσκοπος, παρεμβόλη, τυμπανίζειν, καταχρονίζεσθαι, μελωπή, δέγμα, προβλέπομαι. XII. Τυγαροῦν, νέφος, ἀφωϋόντες, ἀαλογορίζομαι, κάρνειν, ἀντικαθιστάναι, ἐκλανθάνειν, ὀλιγωρεῖν, νόθος, παρῆναι, τροχιά\*, ὄρθος\*, ἐνοχλεῖν, πρωτοτοξία, μετέπειτα, ψηλαγῶν, γνόφος, διαστέλλομαι, φαντασία, ἔντρομος, ἔκφοβος, παρήγορις. σείω, ἀσάλεντος, καταναλίσκω. XIII. Βοηθός, ἠγούμενος, ἀναθεωρούς, εὐποιῶ, ἀλυσιτελής.

The whole number is one hundred and eighteen; from which are to be subtracted those six marked with an asterisk, as they are quoted from the *Septuagint*, and belong not to our author. The amount then of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα is one hundred and twelve. And they are collected, too, with an unsparing hand; e. g. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, τρίμηνον, ἔντρομος, ἔκφοβος, and many other words like these, where it is difficult to see how the author of our epistle could avoid choosing the very terms which he has employed, if we consult the connexion in which they stand.

This list appears, indeed, quite large and formidable to any one, who has not put to the test the principle of reasoning to which it must appeal, if any weight be allowed it in the scale of evidence against our epistle. That principle I shall bring to the test, by subjecting one of Paul's *acknowledged* epistles to an examination, in the same way, and on the same grounds, which Seyffarth, Schulz, and others, have thought proper to adopt in the examination of our epistle.

§ 29. *Objections made against the genuineness of our epistle, compared with those which may be made against the first epistle to the Corinthians.*

It often struck me, while engaged in the toilsome and protracted labour of examining the preceding objections made against the Pauline origin of our epistle, by Schulz and Seyffarth, that the only just method of weighing the whole force of the arguments, which they deduce from peculiarities of phraseology and the choice of words by our author, would be, to carry the same principles of reasoning along with us, to the examination of one of Paul's *acknowledged* epistles, and see whether as great a list of expressions and words, foreign to the other acknowledged epistles of Paul, might not be found, as in the epistle to the Hebrews. This task, so far as I know, has never yet been performed by any critic. And yet, such an experiment seems to be obvious and necessary, in order that we may judge, with any confidence, in regard to the alleged *singularities* of our epistle. I have gone through with the appalling labour of performing such a work; and I shall now present the reader with the results of this undertaking.

In making choice of an epistle among the acknowledged writings of Paul, I found some difficulty. I chose, at last, the first epistle to the Corinthians; because, like that to the Hebrews, it presents several topics that are peculiar to itself. In this respect it has more resemblance to our epistle, than any other of Paul's acknowledged letters. Consequently, a comparison of its peculiarities of phrase and diction, with the other epistles of Paul, would be more like a comparison of our epistle with these, and would be more just, than a similar comparison of any other of Paul's epistles.

I divide the *peculiarities* of the first epistle to the Corinthians, into two great classes.

I. Phraseology peculiar to this epistle, and found no where in the other acknowledged writings of Paul.

1 COR. I. 1 *Ἰγριασμένοι*, as a title of Christians, used no where else by Paul. 2 *Ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ.* as a periphrasis for the idea of *Christians*. 5 *Ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ.* 9 *Εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.* 10 *Παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. . . . .* Paul says, *διὰ Ἰ. Χριστοῦ*, Rom. 15: 30.—*τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε, be in unison—κατηροισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ῥῷ.* 13 *Μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός;* *is Christ divided?* . . . . Paul uses *μερίζω*, in the sense of *impart*, e. g. Rom. 12: 3. 2 Cor. 10: 13. 16 *Λοιπὸν οὐκ οἶδα*, Paul commonly uses *τὸ λοιπὸν*, Eph. 6: 10. Phil. 3: 1. 4: 8. 2 Thess. 3: 1. 17 *Σοφία λόγου*, . . . Paul uses *λόγον σοφίας*, Col. 2: 23.—*κενωθῆ ὁ σταυρός.* 18 *Ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ.* 21 *Μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος.* 25 *Μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.* 27 *Μωρὸν τοῦ κόσμου.* 25 *Ἀσθενές τοῦ θεοῦ.* 27 *Ἀσθενῆ τοῦ κόσμου.* 26 *Βλέπετε τὴν κλῆσιν—σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα—δυνατοί*, for *those in an elevated station.* 30 *Ὅς ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν σοφία. . . . δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις.*

II. 1 *ὑπεροχὴν λόγου.*—*τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ θεοῦ.* 2 *Οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινά τι εἰδέναι*, *I determined not to make known.* 4 *Πειθοὶ σοφίας λόγοι—ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως.* 5 *Σοφία ἀνθρώπων*, *human subtlety.* 6 *Σοφία τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, . . . . in 1 Cor. *σοφία* is used *seventeen* times, in the epistle to the Romans only *once*, and that in a quotation, Rom. 11: 33. 7 *Προώριζεν. . . . πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων.* 8 *Ἀρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου—κύριος τῆς δόξης.* 10 *Ἀποκαλύπτειν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος—πνεῦμα ἐρευνᾷ—τὰ βαθῆ τοῦ θεοῦ.* 13 *Διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις—διδασκτοῖς πνεύματος—πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες.* 14 *Ψυχικός ἀνθρώπος—πνευματικοῖς ἀνακρίνεται.*

III. 1 *Σαρκικοῖς*, as applied to *persons*. 3 *Κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε.* 6 *Ἐγὼ ἐκύτευσά*, applied to the labour of a religious teacher—*Ἀπολλοῦς ἐπότισε*, *Apollo supplied with water*, applied to the same—*θεὸς ἠΐξανε*, *made to increase*, (Hiphil of the Hebrews), no where employed in this sense by Paul, in his other epistles, nor appropriated to designate such a shade of thought. 8 *Ἀήψεται κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον. . . .* Paul says, *κατὰ τὰ ἔργα*, e. g. Rom. 2: 6. 2 Cor. 11: 15. 2 Tim. 4: 14. 9 *Συνεργοὶ θεοῦ—θεοῦ γεώργιον—θεοῦ οἰκοδομή.* 10 *Σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων.* 11 *Θεμέλιον τέθεικα.* 12 *Ἐποικοδομεῖν χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, κ. τ. λ.* 13 *Ἢ ἡμέρα δηλώσει*

—ἐν πρὸ ἀποκαλύπτεται—τὸ πῦρ δοκιμάσει. 14 Μισθὸν λαμβάνειν. 15 Ἔργον κατακαίειν—σωθῆναι ὡς διὰ πυρός. 18 Μωρὸς γίνεσθαι. 21 Ἐν ἀνθρώποις κανχᾶσθαι. 23 Ὑμεῖς Χριστοῖ, Χριστὸς θεοῦ, ye are Christ's, Christ is God's.

IV. 1 Ὑπερέτης Χριστοῦ—οἰκόνομοι μυστηρίων. 3 Εἰς ἐλαχιστὸν εἶναι—ἡμέρα, day of trial, trial. 4 Ἐμμανὴ συνειδεῖν. 5 Πρὸ καιροῦ κρίνειν—βουλαὶ τῶν καρδιῶν—ἔπαινος γίνεται τινί. 6 Μετασχηματίζειν εἰς, to transfer figuratively—τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπται φρονεῖν, not to think of one's self more highly than the Scriptures allow; Paul uses παρ' ὃ . . . φρονεῖν in such a case, Rom. 12: 3, and employs φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ in the sense of having a regard for, Phil. 1: 7. 4: 10.—θυσιοῦν ὑπὲρ . . . . κατὰ. 7 Διακρίνειν τινά, to make one to differ. 8 Κεκοροσμένοι εἶναι—βασιλεύειν, to be in a happy or prosperous state. 9 Ἐσχάτους ἀποδείξει—θέατρον γένεσθαι. 10 Μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν—φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστοῦ—ἰσχυροὶ applied to persons—ἔνδοξοι in the same manner. 13 Περικαθάσματα τοῦ κόσμου—πάντων περὶψημα—ἕως ἄρτι. 14 Ἐντρέπων, act. voice, putting to shame; no where else, except with a passive meaning. 15 Παιδαγωγοὶ ἐν Χριστοῦ—πατέρες [ἐν Χριστοῦ]—ἐν Χριστοῦ . . . . γεννᾶν. 17 Ὁδοὺς . . . . τὰς ἐν Χριστοῦ, Christian doctrines. 19 Ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος θελήσῃ. 20 Βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ . . . οὐ ἐν λόγῳ . . . . ἐν δυνάμει. 21 Ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἐλθεῖν.

V. 1 Ὅλως ἀκούεται—γυναῖκα . . . . ἔχειν, to cohabit with a woman. 2 Πενθεῖν, to be sorrowful; Paul, to make sorrowful, 2 Cor. 12: 21. 3 Ἀπὸν ἐν σώματι, (Paul, ἀπεινὰ ἐν σαρκί, Col. 2: 5.)—παρὸν τῷ πνεύματι. 4 Συναχθέντων ὑμῶν, καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος, is altogether unique, in the shade of idea. 5 Εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ, is altogether peculiar. 7 Ἐκκαθαίρειν . . . . ζύμην—τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν (Χριστὸς) ἐτύθη. 8 Ἐσορᾶζειν ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ—ζύμη κακίας καὶ πονηρίας—ἄζύμοις ἐιλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας. 10 Πόρνοι τοῦ κόσμου τούτου—ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελεθῆναι, to withdraw entirely from converse with men. 12 Τοὺς ἔσω, those within the church.

VI. 1 Προᾶγμα ἔχειν, to have ground for a suit at law. 2 Οἱ ἄγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσι—ἀνάξιοι κριτηρίων. 3 Ἀγγέλους κρινούμεν, altogether sui generis. 4 Καθίζειν, to make to sit as judges. 5 Πρὸς ἐντροπήν λέγω, also in 15: 34.—διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον. 6 Κρίνεται μετὰ, goes to law with—ἄπιστος, used eleven times in this epistle, and not once in Romans, Colossians, Galatians, Ephesians, Thessalonians, Philippians, 2 Timothy. 7 Κρίματα, lawsuits—ἀποσ-

τερόμαι, to suffer one's self to be defrauded—ἀποστερέω, to defraud. 9 Ἄδικοι, for Heb.  $\text{אֲדִיקִים}$ . Paul uses the word but once, and then in the singular number, Rom. 3: 5, and in quite a different way. 11 Δικαιωθῆναι ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ. 12 Πάντα μοι ἔξεστι—συμφέρει, five times in this epistle, and no where else in all of Paul's acknowledged epistles, except twice in 2 Cor.—ἔξουσιάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τινος. 15 Μέλη Χριστοῦ—πόρνης μέλη. 16 Κολλώμενος Κυρίου—κολλώμενος τῇ πόρνη. 20 Ἀγοράζεσθαι τιμῆς—δοξάζειν ἐν τῷ σώματι.

VII. 1 Γυναικὸς ἀπτεσθαι, to cohabit with. 2 Ἐχειν γυναῖκα, to marry or possess a wife. 5 Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε, ye may come together. 14 Ἀγιάζω, in a sense sui generis—ἀκάθαρτος, in a sense peculiar; so also ἅγιος, which follows. 19 Ἡ περιτομὴ οὐδέν . . . . Paul says, οὔτε περιτομὴ τι ἰσχύει, Gal. 5: 6. 6: 15.—ἡ ἀκροβυστία οὐδέν ἐστι—τήρησις ἐντολῶν . . . . Paul says, ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, Rom. 1: 5. 16: 26; or ὑπακοή simply, Rom. 5: 19. 6: 16. 15: 18. 16: 19; or he uses ὑπακούω, Rom. 6: 12. 6: 17. 10: 16 et saepe. 20 Κλήσις, condition in life, rank; no where so employed by Paul. 21 Μὴ σοι μελέτω, be not solicitous—μᾶλλον χρῆσαι, prefer. 25 Ἐπιταγὴν ἔχειν—ἡλεημένος ὑπὸ Κυρίου . . . . Paul uses ἡλεήθην simply, Rom. 11: 30. 2 Cor. 4: 1. 1 Tim. 1: 13, 16. 26 Καλὸν ἀνθρώπων . . . . Paul uses καλόν simply, in the same sense, e. g. Rom. 14: 21. Gal. 4: 18. 29 Τὸ λοιπόν, hereafter, for the future. 31 Χρᾶσθαι τῷ κόσμῳ—τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου. 32 Μεριμνᾶν τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου. 33 Μεριμνᾶν τὰ τοῦ κόσμου . . . . Paul uses μεριμνᾶν τὰ περί. 34 Ἅγια εἶναι σώματι καὶ πνεύματι. 35 Πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον, for the profit. 37 Ἀνάγκη ἔχειν. 40 Δοκεῖν πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν, truly unique, in the epistles.

VIII. 1 Γινῶσιν ἔχειν. 4 Οὐδέν εἶναι ἐν κόσμῳ—οὐδεὶς ἕτερος. 6 Ἡμῖν εἰς θεός, ὁ πατήρ, κ. τ. λ. The whole verse is unique. 7 Συνείδησις, conscientious scruples. 12 Ἀμαρτάνειν εἰς, to sin against—ὑπέπειν συνείδησιν. 13 Βρωῖμα σκανδαλίζει . . . . Paul, διὰ βρωῖμα λυπεῖσθαι, Rom. 14: 15.

IX. 1 Τὸ ἔργον μου . . . ἐν Κυρίῳ. 2 Ἄλλοις . . . ὑμῖν . . . ἀπόστολος . . . . Paul uses the gen., ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, Rom. 11: 13; ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, 2 Cor. 8: 23; ἰμῶν ἀπόστολος, Phil. 2: 25—σφραγὶς τῆς ἀποστολῆς. 5 Γυναῖκα περιάγειν—7, 13 Ἐσθίειν ἐκ, to eat of . . . . Paul uses simply the accusative, e. g. Rom. 14: 2. 2 Thess. 3: 12. 11 Σπείρειν πνευματικά—θερίζειν σαρκικά, to have one's temporal wants supplied. 12 Ἐξουσία, property. 16 Ἀνάγκη

..... ἐπίκειται μοι..... Paul, ἐξ ἀνάγκης 2 Cor. 9 : 7; κατ' ἀνάγκην, Philem. v. 14. 17 Οἰκονομίαν πιστευθῆναι. 19 Ἐλεύθερος ἐκ..... Paul uses ἐλεύθερος ἀπό, Rom. 7: 3. 20 Κερδαίνειν, *to win over*..... in a different sense, Phil. 3: 8. 22 Γίνεσθαι τοῖς πασὶ τὰ πάντα. 24 Βραβεῖον λαμβάνειν. 25 Φθαριστὸς..... ἄφθαριστος στέφανος. 26 Ἄερα δέρειν.

X. 1, 2 The whole of the description presented in these two verses is *sui generis*, and found no where in Paul. 3 Βροῦμα πνευματικόν—πόμα πνευματικόν. 4 Πνευματικῆς πέτρας—and specially the idea of the whole phrase, πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας. So also ἔπινον ἐκ..... Paul uses πιεῖν (2 aor.) with the accusative, Rom. 14: 21. 11 Τύποι συμβαίνειν..... Paul, τύπος simply, Rom. 5: 14; or γίνεσθαι τύπος, 1 Thess. 1: 7. 1 Tim. 4: 12—τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων..... Paul, ἔσχαται ἡμέραι, 2 Tim. 3: 1. 13 Πειρασμὸς ἀνθρώπινος εἴληφε, singular both as to the verb and adjective, joined with πειρασμός. 15 Ὡς φρονίμοις λέγω. 16 ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας—κοινωνία αἵματος—κοινωνία σώματος. 17 Εἷς ἄρτος..... εἶναι, said of Christians communing at the Lord's table. 18 Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα—κοινωνοὶ θυσιαστηρίου. 19 Τί οὖν φημι; 20 Δαιμονίους θύειν—κοινωνοὺς δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι. 21 Ποτήριον δαιμονίων—τράπεζα δαιμονίων. 27 Καλέω, in the sense of *inviting to a meal*. 32 Ἀπρόσκοποι, with the dative after it—πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκειν.

XI. 2 Παραδόσεις κατέχειν. 3 Θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι—παντὸς ἀνδρὸς κεφαλή Χριστός—κεφαλή Χριστοῦ θεός. 4 Κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχειν, *to cover the head*. 5 Καταισχύνειν, *to dishonour*,..... Paul, *to disappoint*, Rom. 5: 5. 9: 33. 10: 11.—τὸ αὐτὸ τι, *the same thing as*, i. e. αὐτὸ with the dative after it. 7 Ἀνήρ..... εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ—γυνὴ δόξα ἀνδρός. 9 Οὐ ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικός κ. τ. λ. 10 Ἐξουσία, *veil, or token of power*—ἄγγελοι, *spies*. 12 Ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός. 14 Θύσις διδάσκει. 17 Συνέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ κοεῖτον..... εἰς τὸ ἦιτον. 20 Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον. 23 Παραλαβεῖν ἀπό..... Paul uses παραλαβεῖν παρὰ, Gal. 1: 12. 2 Thess. 3: 6. 24 Τὸ σῶμα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον. 25 Μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνησαι..... Paul no where uses μετὰ before the inf. mode preceded by τό.—ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμοῦ αἵματι. 27 Ἐνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου. 29 Κρίμα ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν τιτί—διακρίνειν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου. 30 Ἀσθενεῖς, *sickly*—ἱκανοί, *many*..... Paul uses it in the sense of *able, sufficient*, 2 Cor. 2: 6, 16. 3: 5. 2 Tim. 2: 2. 31 Διακρίνειν, *to examine*. 34 Διατάσσο-

μα, to set in order, arrange . . . . Paul uses it for *command*, Tit. 1: 5.

XII. 3 Ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλεῖν—λέγειν ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν—εἰπεῖν κύριον Ἰησοῦν. 6 Ἐνεργεῖν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι . . . . Paul, ἐνεργεῖν τὰ πάντα, Eph. 1: 11. 7 Φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος. 10 Διακρίσεις, powers of distinguishing . . . . Paul, in a different sense, Rom. 14: 1—γένη, kinds . . . . Paul uses γένος for *descent, lineage*, Phil. 3: 5. 13 Εἰς ἐν σῶμα βαπτισθῆναι—εἰς ἐν πνεῦμα ποτισθῆναι . . . Paul uses ποτιζῶ no where, except in a quotation from the Old Testament, Rom. 12: 20. Vs. 15—17. Where is any representation like this, in all the Pauline epistles? Paul introduces the same general image, in Rom. 12: 4, 5, as is found in 1 Cor. 12: 12—14; but he does not pursue it into detail. 23 Τιμὴν περιτιθέναι. 24 Διδόναι τιμὴν . . . . Paul, ἀποδιδόναι τιμὴν, Rom. 2: 7—τὸ αὐτὸ μεριμνᾶν. 26 Μέλος δοξάζεται—συχαιῶ used absolutely, without any dative following it . . . . Paul employs the dative after it, Phil. 2: 17, 18. 27 Ἐκ μέρους, Paul uses ἀπὸ μέρους, Rom. 11: 25. 15: 15, 24. 2 Cor. 1: 13. 2: 5. 28 Τιθέναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, to constitute officers in the church. 28 Where else are such officers in the church mentioned, as ἀντιλήψεις, κυβερνήσεις, δυνάμεις?

XIII. 1 Γλωῖσαι ἀγγέλων. 2 Εἶδεν μυστήριον—ὄρη μεθιστάνειν. 3 Ὑψοίσειν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα. 6 Στέγειν, to cover over. 8 Γλωῖσαι παύσονται, the idea of *speaking in a variety of languages*, is not found attached to γλωῖσσα, in any of the Pauline epistles. 12 Βλέπειν δι' ἐσόπτρου . . . ἐν αἰνίγματι . . . πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον—γινώσκειν ἐκ μέρους.

XIV. 2 Πνεύματι λαλεῖν μυστήρια. 3 Λαλεῖν οἰκοδομὴν . . . παρακλήσειν . . . παραμυθίαν. 5 Οἰκοδομὴν λαβεῖν. 6 Λαλεῖν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει κ. τ. λ. 7 Φωνὴν διδόναι—διαστολὴν διδόναι. 9 Εἰς αἶψα λαλεῖν. 10 Ἐγγάνω, to happen, to be; . . . Paul, in the sense of *obtaining*, 2 Tim. 2: 10. 11 Δύναμις, force of, in the sense of *meaning*—εἶναι βάροβαρός τι. 14, 15 Προσεύχεσθαι γλώσση . . . πνεύματι . . . νοῦ—ψάλλειν πνεύματι . . . νοῦ. 16 Εὐλογεῖν τῷ πνεύματι. 19 Λαλεῖν διὰ νοός. 20 Παιδιά γίνεσθαι ταῖς φρεσὶ—ταῖς φρεσὶ τέλειοι γίνεσθαι. 22 Εἰς σημείον εἶναι . . . Paul, σημείον ἐστι, 2 Thess. 3: 17. 27 Κατὰ δύο, ἢ τρεῖς. 32 Πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται. 33 Ἀκαταστασίας θεός.

XV. 1 Αἰ οὐ [εὐαγγελίου] σώζεσθε. 3 Ἐν πρώτοις, first . . . Paul, πρώτος, Rom. 10: 19. 8 Ἐσχατον πάντων. 10 Εἰμὶ ὃ εἰμι. 14 κενὸν κήρυγμα, κενὴ πίστις. 15 Ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ θεοῦ. 17 Εἶναι ἐν ἁμαρτίαις. 20 Ἀπορχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων. 21 Αἰ



ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος . . . Paul, διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, Rom. 5: 12.—δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν. Vs. 24—28, a passage altogether *sui generis*. 29 Βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν. 38 Σῶμα διδόναι. 40 Σῶμα ἐπίγειον. 42 Σπειρεσθαι ἐν φθορᾷ—ἐγείρεσθαι ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ—σπειρεσθαι ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ—ἐγείρεσθαι ἐν δόξῃ, κ. τ. λ. 44 Σῶμα ψυχικόν—σῶμα πνευματικόν. 47 Ὁ δυνάστης ἄνθρωπος, ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. 49 Φορεῖν εἰκόνα. 50 Σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, κ. τ. λ. 51 Μυστήριον λέγειν . . . Paul, μυστήριον λαλεῖν, Col. 4: 3. 52 Ἐσχάτη σάλπιγξ. 53 Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν, κ. τ. λ. 56 Κέντρον θανάτου, ἡ ἁμαρτία—δύναμις ἁμαρτίας, ὁ νόμος. 57 Διδόναι νίκης.

XVI. 2 Μία σαββάτων—τιθεῖναι παρ' ἑαυτῶν. 7 Ἐν παρόδῳ ἰδεῖν. 9 Θύρα ἀνέβηγε μεγάλη καὶ ἐνεργής. 22 Ἦτω ἀνάθεμα, μαρὰν ἀθά. 24 Ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ, κ. τ. λ. The whole closing salutation is *sui generis*.

Such is the almost incredible mass of *peculiar* phraseology, in the first epistle to the Corinthians. It is possible, that there may be instances among so many, where I may, through the tedium of such an examination, have overlooked some phrase of the same kind in Paul's other epistles. If this be so, the student, who has in his hands a Greek Concordance, will be able easily to detect it. In the mean time, I venture to affirm with entire confidence, (having repeated my investigations a second time), that the number of such mistakes, at most, is not sufficient to affect in any degree, the nature of the argument, or the force of the appeal. I remark only, that where I have appealed to Paul, as not having employed a particular word or phrase, or as not using it in a like sense, I mean, of course, that Paul has not done this, in his other *acknowledged* epistles.

If any one is disposed to object to this array of phrases *sui generis*, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, and to aver, that many of them are nearly like those used by Paul, and that others are occasioned by the peculiarity of the subjects of which the writer treats, and that, in general, they are collected with an unsparing hand; I have only reply, that, in all respects, they are as fairly and as sparingly collected, as those brought forward by Schulz and Seyffarth. For the correctness of this, I make the appeal to every unprejudiced man, who has read attentively and

critically the essays of these authors, in which they have brought forward their objections against the genuineness of our epistle.

As a counter-part for the appalling list of one hundred and eighteen *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, in the epistle to the Hebrews, which Seyffarth has presented, I offer,

II. The *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, in the first epistle to the Corinthians.

*Ἄγαμος, ἀγενής, ἀγνωσία, ἀγοράζω, ἀδάπανος, ἄδηλος, ἀδήλως, ἄδης, ἄζυμος, αἰνίγμα, ἀκατακάλυπτος, ἀκολουθῶ, ἀκρασία, ἄκων, ἀλαλάζω, ἀμείμιμος, ἀμετακίνητος, ἀμπελών, ἀνά, ἀνακρίνω, ἀνάμνησις, ἀνάξιος, ἀναξίως, ἀνδριζομαι, ἀντίληψις, ἀπάγω, ἀπελεύθερος, ἀπεισιπαστός, ἀπόδειξις, ἀπολούω, ἀποφέρω, ἄργυρος, ἄροτριῶν, ἄρπαξ, ἄρῶστος, ἀρχιτέκτων, ἀσθενέστερος, ἀστήρ, ἀστειέω, ἀσχημονέω, ἀσχήμων, ἄτιμος, ἄτομος, αὐλέω, αὐλός, αὐριον, ἄφωνος, ἄψυχος.*

*Βρόχος, βιωτικός, γάλα, γεώργιον, γογγύζω, γραμματεὺς, γυμνητεύομαι, δειπνέω, δειπνον, διαίρεσις, δίδακτος, διεορμενευτής, διεορμενεύω, διόπερ, δουλαγωγέω, δράσσομαι, ἐγκοπή, ἐγκρατεύομαι, εἰδωλεῖον, εἰδωλόθυτον, εἰσακούω, ἐκβασίς, ἐκγαμίζω, ἐκδέχομαι, ἐκνήφω, ἐκπειράζω, ἐκτρομα, ἐλεεινός, ἐνέργημα, ἔνομος, ἔνοχος, ἐντροπή, ἐξαίρω, ἐξεγείρω, ἐξεστι, ἐξουσιάζω, ἐορτάζω, ἐπαινέω, ἐπιβάλλω, ἐπιθανάτιος, ἐπιθυμητής, ἐπισπάομαι, ἐπιτοαυτό, ἐρημνεία, ἔσοπτρον, ἐτερόγλωσσοι, εὐγενής, εὐκαιρέω, εὐπρόσεδρος, εὐσημος, εὐσχημοσύνη, εὐσχήμων, ἠχέω, the form ἦτω from εἰμί, θάπτω, θέατρον, θηριομαχέω, θύω, ἴαμα, ἰσχυρότερος, κάθασμα, καίω, καλάμη, κατακαίω, κατακαλύπτομαι, κατάκειμαι, κατασιρώννυμι, καταχράομαι, κείρω, κέντρον, κιθάρα, κιθαρίζω, κινδυνεύω, κλάω, κλάζω, κόκκος, κομή, κομάω, κορέννυμι, κρεῖσσον in the sense of the adverb better, 7:38, κριτήριον, κτήνος, κυβέρησις, κύμβαλον, κυρίακος.*

*Λιθάζω, λογία, λοιδορέω, λοιδορος, λύσις, μαίνομαι, μάκελλον, μακαριώτερος, μαλακός, μαρὰν ἄθά, μέθυσος, μέλει, μετέχω, μηνύω, μοιχός, μολύνω, μύριοι, μωρία, νή, νίκος, νηπιάζω, ξυράω, ὀλοθρευτής, ὄλως, ὀμιλία, ὀσάκις, ὄσφρησις, οὐαί, οὐδέποτε, οὐδέπω, οὐθέν, οὐπω, ὄφελος, παιδίον, παίζω, πανταχοῦ, παραγίνομαι, παραμένω, παραμυθία, πάροδος, παροξύνομαι, πάσχα, πειθός, περιάγω, περιβύλαιον, περικάθασμα, περισσοτερον, περιτίθημι, περίψημα, περπερεύομαι, πνευματικῶς, ποιμαίνω, ποιμνή, πόμα, πορνέω, πορνή, ποτήριον, προσεδρεύω, προσκυνέω, προσφη-*

τεύω, πτηνόν, πυκιεύω, πωλέω, ῥάβδος, ῥιπή, σαλπίζω, σελήνη, σῆτος, στάδιος, συγγνώμη, συγκεράννυμι, συζημητής, συμμερίζομαι, σύμφωνος, συνέχομαι, συναγω, συνειδέω, συνήθεια, συσιέλλα, σχολάζω, τάγμα, τήρησις, τοίνυν, τύπτω, ὑπέρακμος, ὑπηρέτης, ὑποπιάζω, φιλόνηκος, φρήν, φυτεύω, χαλκός, χοϊκός, χόρτος, χρηστεύομαι, ψευδομάργυρ, ψυχικός, ὡσπερεί. In the whole, 230 words.

In order now to estimate the comparative force of the argument, from these ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, we must take into the account the comparative length of the first epistle to the Corinthians and of our epistle. In the Bible lying before me, the former occupies thirteen pages, the latter ten; i. e. the former, in respect to length, is to the latter, as thirteen to ten. Now in the epistle to the Hebrews, are found one hundred and eighteen ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, according to the reckoning of Seyffarth; in the epistle to the Corinthians, if I have reckoned rightly, (I have repeated, a second time, the whole examination), there are two hundred and thirty. Consequently, in the epistle to the Hebrews, the average number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα is a little short of *twelve* to a page; while the average number in the first epistle to the Corinthians, is (within a small fraction) *eighteen* to a page.

Certain is it, then, that if the number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in our epistle proves that it was not from the hand of Paul, it must be more abundantly evident that Paul cannot have been the author of the first epistle to the Corinthians, which has a proportion of one half more ἅπαξ λεγόμενα than our epistle.

Such is the basis of the arguments, so confidently adduced by Schulz and Seyffarth, and so much applauded and trusted in, by many other critics. It has been often said by logicians, that "what proves too much, proves nothing." This is *well said*; and applied to the case before us, it will show, at once, that the very same means used to overturn the opinion, that Paul was the author of our epistle, would overturn the opinion that he wrote any other particular epistle, which is universally acknowledged as coming from his hand.

But what shall we say, when in addition to all the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα of words, we reckon up the *phrases* of the same sort, which have been adduced above? Is here not a mass of evidence ap-

parently overwhelming? Surely, if the first epistle to the Corinthians had been anonymous, the whole body of modern writers, who have attacked the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, must have, with one unanimous voice, disclaimed the first epistle to the Corinthians as belonging to Paul. In all respects which have any reference to the number of *peculiar* phrases and words that are ἄπαξ λεγόμενα, the first epistle to the Corinthians presents far stronger evidence of *not* being Pauline, than our epistle does.

So unsafe is this argument, although often produced and much relied upon, in respect to the important subject which we are examining! How much easier, too, is it to make assertions at hazard, on a subject of this nature, than it is to go through with the excessive labour of verifying such assertions, by means of that great rectifier of wandering critics—a Greek Concordance? Had this been done, long ago, the world had been spared a great deal of useless labour, and literature the record of many a hasty conclusion, from premises unexamined and unestablished.

But further, the argument against the genuineness of the first epistle to the Corinthians could be easily amplified, by appealing still farther to the same kind of arguments, as are adduced against our epistle. For example; how easy to ask, ‘If the first epistle to the Corinthians be Paul’s, how is it possible, that in so long a letter, there is no discussion of Paul’s favourite topics in which he was so deeply interested? How comes it about, that we have nothing about justification by faith, without the deeds of law; nothing of the vanity and folly of Jewish rites and ceremonies; nothing which asserts the equal rights of Jews and Gentiles, and blames the Judaizing teachers and zealots who refused to acknowledge this? Where has Paul ever descanted, as here, on the subject of spiritual gifts; on the marriage relation, conditions, habits, and dress of women; on the Lord’s supper; on the support of preachers; on the comparative value of spiritual gifts, and of faith, hope and love; and above all, on the controverted and speculative questions of his time, respecting the manner in which the bodies of the saints would rise from their graves, when

the last trumpet should sound? Where else has Paul, or any other sacred writer, intimated, that the regal power of the Messiah would cease, after the day of judgment, and that he would be subjected to the Father? Is there any parallel to this epistle, either for matter or manner, in all the acknowledged writings of Paul?’

I might proceed still further, and collect a large number of favourite expressions, often repeated, in this epistle, but which seldom or never occur in the other Pauline epistles. Many such I have noticed, in the course of my investigations; many more than Dr. Schulz has been able to collect from the epistle to the Hebrews. And if the *two* epistles to the Corinthians were to be the subject of investigation, instead of the first only, the list of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* and *ἅπαξ λογιζόμενα*, and of favourite idioms, and peculiar ideas, might be swelled to an enormous catalogue. I have observed, as I feel quite well satisfied, more *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in the second epistle to the Corinthians in proportion to its length, than in the first; and quite as many peculiar phrases. In a word, after such an investigation as I have been through, I am bold to say, that there is not a single epistle of Paul’s which may not be wrested from him, by arguments of the very same kind, as those by which the genuineness of our epistle is assailed, and in all respects of equal validity.

Unfortunately for the cause of criticism, so just and obvious an investigation has not hitherto been entered upon. Most of those who have doubted the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews, have seemed to consider it as quite proper to make out from it all the *specialities* possible, and then to reason from them, without any fear of mistake. I have examined their arguments in detail, because I wished to shew how many hasty and incorrect assertions have been brought forward as arguments. I have now exhibited the application of the *principles*, on which their whole argument stands, to one of Paul’s epistles, the genuineness of which no critic calls in question. The result is so plain, that it cannot be mistaken.

“But,” it will be asked, “can we never reason, in any case, from *dissimilarity of language* in different compositions, to *dif-*

ferent persons as authors?" No doubt we may, in some cases. But not unless the difference be greater, than in the case before us. It has been shown above, how many striking traits of resemblance to the other letters of Paul, there are in our epistle. While these remain, the discrepancy can never be made out to be great enough to build a sound argument upon it. If the question were to be asked, Whether the author of the epistle to the Romans could have written the first epistle of John? the answer would be easy, nay almost absolutely certain, from *internal* evidence. But after all the striking resemblances which can be shewn between our epistle and Paul's letters; after proving from actual examination, that the list of peculiarities, in one of his most conspicuous and acknowledged epistles, is much greater than in our epistle; after making all the reasonable abatements which must be made, from the peculiarity of the subjects which are discussed in our epistle, and of the condition of those to whom it was addressed; after reflection upon the acknowledged fact, that every writer's style is more or less altered by advancing age; by the circumstances of haste or leisure in which he writes; by the topics themselves which he discusses; by the degree of excitement which he feels at the time; above all, taking into consideration the fact, that every writer who travels to many different countries, resides in many different places, and is conversant with a great variety of men and of dialects, is much more liable to change his style somewhat, than he who always resides in the same place, and is conversant with the same men and books; after taking, I say, all these things into consideration, can any man have reasonable grounds to be satisfied, that the peculiarity of style and diction in our epistle is such, that its Pauline origin is to be rejected on account of them? I will not undertake to answer for others; but for myself, I can say with a clear and an abiding conviction, I do not feel that such an argument can stand before the impartial tribunal of criticism.

§ 30. *Objections by De Wette.*

While the preceding sheet was under the press, the Historical and Critical Introduction to the New Testament, by W. M. L. De Wette, came to hand. It was published at Berlin, during the last year; and exhibits the views of its celebrated author, in regard to the origin of our epistle.

De Wette is the well known author of a commentary on the Psalms, of a translation of about one half of the Old and New Testaments, of a Hebrew Archaeology, of a historical and critical Introduction to the Old Testament, and of some other works in the departments of sacred criticism and moral science; all of which have attracted great attention on the continent of Europe, on account of the distinguished genius and extensive erudition of the author. He is now a Professor, in the University of Bâle, in Switzerland.

De Wette takes side, (as from his habits of thinking and reasoning he might be expected to do), with those who deny the Pauline origin of our epistle. His arguments are very brief, (as the nature of his book required them to be); and I am not a little surprised to find, that among them all, there is not a single one, which is not drawn from the works that have been already examined above.

*In regard to the external evidence*, he has given many of the principal citations, which are adduced in the preceding part of this discussion, pp. 92—129. But some important ones he has omitted, which speak most unequivocally against the views he gives of the opinion of the fathers. For example, he merely refers to Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VI. 25, in respect to the very important testimony of Origen, which the reader will find on p. 104 seq. above; simply remarking that “Origen gives up the writing down of the epistle by Paul, and only attributes the *matter* of it to him, p. 285.” In a note, he subjoins, “When he [Origen] speaks of the tradition of the churches, it is probable, that he means only the Alexandrine church.” In regard to such a probability, I must refer the reader to what is said above, p. 111.

no. 7. The probability is very strong, that all of Origen's homilies must have been published in Palestine, for he was licensed to preach but a few months before he was driven from Alexandria; see Lardner's *Credib.* III. 194. Whether Origen would, under such circumstances, be likely to retain any superstitious veneration for the church at Alexandria, every reader will be able to judge, so as to satisfy his own mind. It will be remembered, that the testimony in question of Origen, is from one of his *Homilies* on the epistle to the Hebrews.

In the same manner, he has merely made a simple reference to the important testimony of Jerome, in his epistle to Dardanus, cited above, p. 127; while he has inserted at full length, all the passages which might serve to shew that Jerome had doubts in his own mind, in regard to the Pauline origin of our epistle. This he avers to have been the fact. But whether there is any just foundation for such an assertion, has already been examined above, p. 127 seq. Jerome, no doubt, felt himself obliged to use great caution, in regard to the manner in which he spoke of the epistle to the Hebrews, because the prevailing sentiment of the western churches, in his time, was against the Pauline origin of it. More than this can never be fairly deduced, from any of the language which he employs. The passages in his epistle to Dardanus, in his commentary on Matt. xxvi., and in his book *De Viris Illustribus* c. V, (supra, pp. 127, 128, 44), can never be made to speak less than a decided, definite opinion, on the part of Jerome himself, in respect to the Pauline origin of our epistle. How should he have been the occasion of revolutionizing the whole of the western churches, in regard to the sentiment under consideration, if this were not the case?

Other testimonies, too, De Wette has omitted, which are in favour of the Pauline origin of our epistle. In stating the opposition of the Latin churches to this sentiment, he has brought forward the doubts of Jerome, and of his contemporaries. He has followed these on, down to the seventh century, by quoting from Primasius, and Isidore Hispaliensis. But he has not once hinted, that in this same western church, all those distinguished bishops who are mentioned above (p. 126), admitted our epistle to



be Paul's; excepting that he has adduced some of the testimony of Jerome and Augustine.

Besides, he has advanced the broad position, that "the western churches originally (anfänglich) denied this epistle to be Paul's." The passages adduced, in proof of this, are Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VI. 20, (cited above, p. 114); V. 26, (supra p. 119); the passages from Photius, Gobar, and Hippolytus, (supra pp. 119, 120); Tertullian, de Pudicitia, c. 20, (supra p. 123 seq.); Cyprian, de Martyr. c. XI., (supra p. 125); Jerome, Epist. ad Paulinum, (supra p. 127); and Philastrius, de Haeres. c. 89, who speaks only of the opinion of others, himself believing the epistle to be Paul's. But De Wette has not said a word, in this connexion, of all the evidence adduced in § 12 above, which has relation to this subject; nor of the division of opinion, that existed in the Latin churches of later times, and before the days of Jerome, in respect to the subject in question.

Again, in stating the testimony of the eastern churches, De Wette has merely brought forward Eusebius, as testifying to the opinions of his own times; see Eusebius' testimony above, p. 113 seq. At the same time, he intimates that there were doubts, in that part of the church, in regard to the Pauline origin of our epistle. He has not, however, produced a single author from the East who has expressed any such doubts, (and this for a very imperious reason); while, at the same time, he has sedulously omitted all those, cited on p. 118 above, who undoubtedly ascribed our epistle to Paul.

Is this, now, an *impartial* examination and statement of evidence, on this great question? And has an author, who writes in this hasty manner, without extended examination, and without deliberation, any right to find fault with others, when they refuse to receive his allegations with implicit credit, and betake themselves to such an examination, as may detect imperfect representation and statements evidently dictated by partiality?

Next, *as to the internal grounds of proof*, that our epistle does not belong to Paul.

These are, without exception, the same as had been before advanced by Eichhorn, Ziegler, Bertholdt, Schulz, and Seyf-

farth ; all of which have been examined in the preceding pages. De Wette states, very categorically, that the language of our epistle is very different from that of Paul ; and he appeals to Schulz as having most fully shewn this, in the work which has been already examined. How far the case is as Schulz has represented it, must now be left to the reader, to judge for himself.

What most of all surprises me, is, that De Wette should produce, as special proof of the alleged discrepancy of style, the formulas of quotation, examined p. 204 seq. no. 18 above ; and also the appellations given to the Saviour by the writer of our epistle, examined in p. 211 seq. no. 19 above ; two of the most unlucky of all the arguments, which Schulz and Seyffarth have adduced. It requires, indeed, a great deal of patience and labour, to examine this matter to the bottom ; more, I am quite inclined from bitter experience to believe, than De Wette consumed in writing the whole of the article in his Introduction, which has respect to our epistle.

Besides these two cases of *diversity* of style, De Wette has proceeded to cite a large list of words ; all of which are taken from Schulz and Seyffarth, and have already been the subject of particular examination. With an adventurous step, and without even opening his Greek Concordance for investigation, he has followed his leaders in this hazardous path, and even selected the words examined above, on p. 228 no. 34, p. 229 no. 37, not omitting the most unfortunate of all Dr. Schulz's *guesses*, viz. the phrases on p. 230 no. 40, above. The word *πίστις*, too, has come in for its usual share of *discrepancy*, (see above, p. 184. e.), and also *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* and *τελείωσις*.

He avers, moreover, after Schulz, that the comparison and symbolical use of Old Testament passages and ordinances, is foreign to the manner of Paul, and like to that of Philo. (See on this subject, p. 153 seq. no. 2, above). He asserts, too, that Paul could not have represented Christianity so correspondent with Judaism, nor Christ as high priest ; nor would he have been silent about his office of apostle to the heathen, nor concealed the fact, that the Christian religion was designed as well for Gentiles as Jews.

Yet, how many of Paul's epistles there are, in which these topics are not insisted on, and which De Wette himself does not suppose to be spurious, he does not seem once to have thought of. How is it possible, that such a writer as Paul should be limited to one circle of objects, and reasoning, and expression? De Wette would not like to have the genuineness of his own works tried by such a rule of scrutiny.

On the question, To whom was our epistle directed? De Wette has exhibited a singular method of treating the subject. He endeavours to present difficulties, that lie in the way of supposing that it was directed to any church; and then comes to the conclusion, that probably it was not originally an *epistle*, but the composition of some companion of Paul, who added the personal allusions toward the close of the letter, for the sake of giving credit to it as a composition of the apostle; so that all investigation about either the author of the epistle, or the persons to whom it is directed, is in vain and useless, pp. 292—294. It seems after all, then, that the author of our epistle is a dissembler and dishonest man; aiming to stand upon the credit of Paul, because he fears that his own credit is insufficient. But can any candid reader of our epistle refuse to see the unequivocal marks of sincerity, candour, high raised benevolent feeling, and spiritual comprehensive views, every where exhibited? I repeat it, had the writer of such a piece any need of propping up himself, by the aid of even Paul's name and authority? Then how futile, nay foolish, the attempt to do so, if his style, diction, manner, reasoning, quotations, circle of thought—in a word, every thing—is so *toto coelo* diverse from that of Paul, as Schulz, Seyffarth, and De Wette represent it! Where were the eyes and understandings of the readers? Could they not detect the imposture? And then what would become of the epistle, and of the reputation of the man who wrote it? One ought to have better reasons than these, to abandon the convictions which a thorough investigation will force upon him.

§ 31. *Objections by Boehme.*

The work of De Wette, noticed in the preceding section, was accompanied by a recent work of C. F. Boehme, comprised in a volume of about 800 pages; which contains an introduction to our epistle, and a translation of the same, followed by a copious commentary. Of the author little is known in this country, and, (if I may judge by such reviews of books in Germany as I have perused), little is said in his own country respecting him. The work was printed at Leipsic, in 1825.

Like the critics, whose works have been examined in the preceding sections, Boehme sets out with the most unqualified assertions respecting the discrepancies of style and manner, between the author of our epistle, and all the other writers of the New Testament. He asserts, that ‘as to the form and method of his work, the rhetorical construction of it, and the constant and accurate observance of order, our author far excels the other contemporary sacred writers.’ He extols the art which the writer of our epistle uses, in order to persuade those whom he addressed to follow his advice; in particular, he gives as examples of this, Heb. 3: 7—4: 13, where the writer very dexterously, as he says, turns the promise of rest in the land of Canaan, into a promise of rest in the heavenly world; to which he adds Heb. 11: 8—16, where, he avers, that “the author by the aid of his rhetorical art, and *contra fidem historiae*, has rendered it *aliquatenus probabile*, that Abraham and the other patriarchs had a spiritual rest in view.”

With many other eulogies he loads the author of our epistle, on account of his art, his eloquence, and his excellent Greek; and from all this, (as was to be anticipated), he comes to the conclusion, that the author could not be Paul, nor any of the other writers of the New Testament, being far superior to them all.

Into the historical and critical examination of this question, however, he does not even pretend to go. He avers, that to do so would be merely *agere actum*. He considers the works of Schulz, Seyffarth, and Ziegler; as having finally settled the question, be-

yond any hope of retrieve by those who advocate the Pauline origin of our epistle ; and after appealing to the authors just named, and to the considerations which he has himself suggested, in respect to the discrepancies of style and manner between the author and Paul, he concludes by saying, “that Paul was not the author, *satis superque demonstratum est, a nobis aliisque.*”

This is indeed a summary method of despatching a question of this nature ; certainly it is a method, which spares writers and readers a great deal of severe labour and study. Unfortunately, however, for all these rhetorical appeals to the mere feelings and imagination of men, there are some, at least, who believe in the Pauline origin of our epistle, that are too *φιλόπονοι* to shrink from bringing the whole matter to the test of actual investigation, and who will insist upon it, that those who make assertions, are bound in duty to prove them.

The work of Boehme, under examination, is not one which bids fair to bring any accession of strength to the cause of those, who deny the Pauline origin of our epistle ; and all which I could wish to say respecting his suggestions, has been already said, in the preceding pages.

I cannot deny, however, that he has exhibited something *new* in his book. He has endeavoured to shew, that Silas or Silvanus was the author of our epistle, and that it was directed to the church at Antioch ; conjectures, which not only have not a single voice of ancient testimony in their favour, but which are destitute of any circumstances that render them even in a slight degree probable. I cannot help thinking of Boehme’s introduction to his work, much as one of his countrymen thinks of a certain author, who has made some noise of late in the medical world ; “He has some new things, and some true things ; but his new things are not true things, and his true things are not new things.”

§ 32. *Hebraisms of the Epistle.*

All the writers, who have declared against the Pauline origin of our epistle, have appealed to Origen's declaration, 'Ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, the epistle [to the Hebrews] in the texture of its style is more conformed to the Greek idiom, [than the epistles of Paul]. Eichhorn, Bertholdi, Ziegler, Schulz, Seyffarth, De Wette, Boehme, and others, have one and all urged this consideration, and insisted upon it, that Origen's judgment, on this point, must be considered as decisive.

In respect to the general principles of criticism, which are to regulate our investigation of such a matter, I have already said all which I wish to say, p. 177 seq. no. 4. The actual comparison of our epistle with the acknowledged epistles of Paul, has also been made, pp. 141—172 above. It may, however, be of some importance to add, in this place, a list of some of the Hebraisms which occur in our epistle, in order to meet the very categorical assertion of De Wette and Boehme, that 'the style of our epistle is not only very different from that of Paul, but he composes in purer Greek, and with a far more oratorical diction.'

Words and phrases used in a Hebraistic sense, or in a way different from what is usual in the Greek classics.

CHAP. I. 1 Πατράσσι, *ancestors of old time*, אֲבוֹתָא. Seldom or never does classical Greek so employ this word. 'Ἐν ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν, *the time of the Messiah, the last age of the world*, אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים; purely Hebrew. 2 Κληρονόμος, *lord, ruler*, יוֹרֵשׁ; in classic Greek, one who takes by lot, or by testament. 3 Δόξα, *splendor, brightness, radiance*, קְבוֹרָה; in Greek, opinion, sentiment, maxim, fame, honour. Ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, *of his substance*, i. e. of himself. מַצְבְּאוֹ, מַצְבָּאוֹ. Καθαρισμὸν . . . τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, *expiation for sin*, הַתְּשׁוּבָה, (Sept. καθαρισμός, Ex. 29: 36. 30: 10); see Comm. in loc. Μεγαλοσύνη, *majesty, excellence*, אַתְּקָרָה, מְגָלָה; not found in the classics. 'Ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, *in heaven, in the world above*, בְּמַרְוֵם, Sept. ἐν ὑψηλοῖς. 4 Ἀεκληρονομήζην, *obtained*, הָרַשׁ; Greek, to acquire by lot, to inherit. Same word in 1: 14.

I omit purposely all the *quotations* which follow here, and all throughout the epistle, which are made from the ancient Scriptures; because, as they were doubtless made, in general, from the Septuagint version, they cannot be justly considered as properly belonging to the style of our author. If the Hebraisms in all these quotations, were to be added to the list of those in the rest of the epistle, it would make it to appear something very different from *Ἑλληνικωτέρα*. Whether Origen did, or did not, mean to exclude them, no one, so far as I know, has yet attempted to show.

II. 2 *Λόγος*, *commination, command, or revelation*, רַב־דָּבָר; not so in the classics. 3 *Σωτηρίας*, *the Christian religion with its threats and promises*; certainly not a classical sense of the word. 4 *Δυνάμεις*, *miraculous powers, miracles*, עֲזָרָה, מַעֲשֵׂה כֹחַ, all of which the Septuagint translate by *δύναμις*; in the classics, not so. *Θέλησιν*, a word unknown to the Attics. 5 *Οἰκουμένην μέλλουσαν*, *the gospel dispensation*, מַעֲשֵׂה הַיְהוָה; purely Jewish. 10 *Δόξαν*, *future happiness, a glorious condition in another world*; peculiar to Hellenistic Greek. 11 *Ἀγιάζων* and *ἀγιαζόμενοι*, *making atonement for, and, those for whom atonement is made, or, who are expiated*, שָׁבַת and רָפָא are both rendered by *ἀγιάζω* in the Septuagint; in the classics, *ἀγιάζω* means to consecrate, to make or declare sacred. *Ἰθαγενεῖς*, *socios, amicos, ejusdem naturae participes*, אֲחֵי הַדָּר; classics, either children of the same parents, or near relatives, kindred by descent. 12 *Ἐκκλησία*, *public religious assembly*, קְהָל, עֲדָתָהּ, מִן־הַקְּהָל; classics, public civil assembly. 14 *Σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος*, *human nature, corporeal state or condition*, בָּשָׂר, דָּם=בָּשָׂר, see Gen. 9: 4. and in the New Testament, I Cor. 15: 50. Matt. 16: 17. Gal. 1: 16. al.; not so used in the classics. *Καταργήση*, *to destroy, to render null or inefficacious*; classics, to be idle, to remain sluggish or inactive. *Διάβολον*, *Satan*, הַשָּׂטָן, *the devil*; classics, a slanderer, an accuser. 16 *Ἀγγέλων*, *angels, heavenly messengers*, מַלְאָכִים; in the classics, *ἄγγελος* means messenger, or, message. *Σπέρματος*, *progeny, offspring*, זָרַע, frequent in the New Testament, and three times in our epistle; rarely, if ever, has it this sense among the classics. The frequency of it is Hellenistic.

III. I *Ἰθαελκοὶ ἄγιοι*, אֲחֵי הַדָּר, Ps. 16: 3 et saepe, *professed people of God, worshippers of God*; in a sense different from the *ἅγιος* of the classics. *Κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου*, *invitations or privileges of the gospel*; no parallel in common Greek. *Ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας*; such a combination is utterly foreign to the classics.

2 *Οἴκω* in the sense of *worshippers of God, the assembly of the faithful*, בֵּית אֱלֹהִים, בֵּית; peculiar to Hellenistic Greek. So 13 *Καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν*, כָּל הַיּוֹם, continually, constantly. *Σκληρύνω*, קָשָׁה, applied to the heart or mind; literally used only in the classics. 16 *Παρεπίκραναν*, מָרַר, סָרַר, not of classic usage. 17 *Προσώχθισε*, קָטַט; not a classic word. *Ἀμαρτήσασι*, הַטָּאִים, *sinners, violators of divine precepts*; classic usage, to miss the mark, to fail, etc.; the sense of *sinners or offenders*, as in our epistle, is seldom and doubtful in the classics. *Κῶλα*, *carcasses, corpses*, פְּגָרִים; in common Greek, members, limbs. 18 *Κατάπαυσιν*, מְנוּחָה, *rest, future rest or happiness*; Greek, a causing of rest, stilling, quieting.

IV. 2 *Εὐαγγελισμένοι*, בְּשָׂר, used here in a more appropriate and peculiar sense, than in the classics. *Ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς*, שְׂמִיעָה, שְׂמִיעָה, found in Paul, 1 Thess. 2: 13; the words are classic, but the combination is altogether diverse from any in the classics. 12 *Ζῶν*, *perpetual, enduring, or active*, חַי, as in חַי אֱלֹהִים; not in the classics. 13 *Οὐκ . . . κτίσις*, כֵּן לֹא, Greek *οὐδέν*, *no creature, nothing*; *κτίσις*, in the classics, means, *the act of creating*. 14 *Οὐρανούς*, שָׁמַיִם, the Hebrew idea of the *firmament above*. *Ὁμολογίας*, *religion, professed subjection to Christ*, Sept. for נִדָּר, *votum*. 15 *Ἀσθενείαις*, *moral weaknesses*, Sept. for מְבַשְׁוֹל *stumbling*, and צַלְעָה *claudicatio*; classics, *physical weakness*, with various shades. 16 *Θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*, without a parallel in the classics.

V. 3 *Προσφέρειν*, *to offer gifts and sacrifices to God*, הִקְרִיב, הִקְרִיב, הִבִּיא, הִבִּיא; in Greek, not appropriate to this sacred rite. 7 *Εἰσακουσθεῖς*, *delivered, saved*, Sept. for הוֹשִׁיעַ, הוֹשִׁיעַ. 12 *Τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων*; such an expression is wanting in the classics. *Γάλακτος . . . τροφῆς*, not a classical metaphor. 13 *Λόγου δικαιοσύνης*, *Christian or religious doctrine*; without an example in the classics.

VI. 1 *Νεκρῶν ἔργων*, *deadly, destructive works*, הַרְגָּה, הַרְגָּה *occidere*, Septuagint, *νεκρός*. 2 *Βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, επιθέσεως τε χειρῶν*, foreign to the classics; as is *κρίματος αἰωνίου*. 4 *Πνεύματος ἁγίου*, הַקְדוֹשׁ הַקָּדוֹשׁ; an expression and an idea foreign to all the classics. 5 *Καλὸν . . . ῥῆμα*, *promise of good*, so דְּבַר טוֹב often in Hebrew; classics, *declaration, any thing uttered*. *Δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, *miraculous powers under the gospel dispensation*; an utter stranger to the classic authors. 7 *Βοτάνην*, any kind of *fruit* which the earth produces, עֵשֶׂב; in Greek, simply *herbage, vegetation*. 10 *Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, *toward him, toward*



his cause, for his sake, (נְשִׂיבָה), ὄνομα being pleonastic, as in Hebrew. 12 Μακροθυμίας, patient waiting, מְרַבֵּץ, prolongatio, Sept.; which I cannot find in the classics. 15 Τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, the promised blessing; classic sense, promise.

VII. 1 Θεοῦ ὑψίστου, הַיְיָ; the words are classic Greek, but the combination is Hebrew. Κοπῆς, slaughter, מַצֵּץ; Greek, hewing, cutting out. 3 Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, without any genealogy of parents; the classic writers apply these words to their gods, and to orphan children, in quite a different sense. 4 Ἀροθινίων, spoils in general, (see Gen. 14: 20); classics, first fruits, part of the spoils of war presented to the gods. Πατριάρχης, מַלְאָכֵי אֱלֹהִים; I cannot find any trace of this word in the classics. 5 Ἀποδεκατόω, to tithe, to take a tenth part, עָשָׂר; peculiar to Hebrew Greek. Ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ, יָצְאוּ מִתְּחִיבֵי אֲבְרָהָם; the Greeks said, γενναῖσθαι ὑπό τινος, in such a case, so that the above expression is purely Hebrew. 6 Δεκατόω, as ἀποδεκατόω in v. 5. 10 Ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρός, see above on v. 5. 11 Τελειώσις, in a sense sui generis. 16 Σαρκοικῆς, perishable, short lived, מְרַבֵּץ; not found in the classics in such a sense. 20 Ὀσχωμοσίας, peculiar to our epistle; the classic ὀσχωμόσια (with antepenult accent) is an adjective, ἰερά being understood after it. 22 Διαθήκης, in the sense of the Hebrew בְּרִית.

VIII. 2 Ἁγίων, plur., קְדוֹשִׁים; classics, ἅγιον. Σκηνης, the divine אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד; classics, a common tent or dwelling. 6 Μεσίτης, in a different sense from what is usual in the classics. The long quotation from the Septuagint that follows, is not more Hebraistic than the surrounding context.

IX. 1 Δικαιώματα, ordinances, arrangements, מִשְׁפָּטִים; classics, sentence of justice, decision, just action or requisition. 5 Ἰλαστήριον, מְרַבֵּץ, Septuagint word; classics, ἰλαστήριος -ία, -ον, adjective. 9 Παραβολή, symbol; classics, comparison, similitude in speech or writing. 11 Ἀρχιερεὺς μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, unlike any thing in the classics. 12 Ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, of the present world; κτίσις in the classics means, the act of creating. Εὐθάρμενος, form sui generis. 13 Κεκοινωνημένους, the unclean, מְרַבֵּץ; Greek κοινώω, to communicate, to share, to render common. Ἀγιάζει, purifies, קָדַשׁ; Greek, to consecrate, to devote. 16 Φέροσθαι, accidere, to happen; it is sui generis. 18 Ἐγγεκαίνισται, was ratified; classics, to renew. 22 Αἱματεχυσίας, sui generis. 26 Καταβολῆς κόσμου, a combination unknown to the classics. Συντελεία τῶν

αἰώνιον, the end of the former dispensation; no where in common Greek. 23 Ἀμαρτίας, sin offering, sacrifice for sin, אֲחֻזָּה, אֲחֻזָּה; not in the classics.

X. 1 Εἰκόνα, complete image, perfect delineation, (in distinction from σκιά, an imperfect sketch), תְּבִינָה; the Greek εἰκών is simply, image. Τελειῶσαι, in a more pregnant sense than any classic usage gives to it. 13 Τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, a phrase purely Hebraistic in its hue; see Ps. 110: 1. [2]. 20 Ζῶσαν, qualifying such a word as ὄδον, is a combination unknown to the classics. 22 Ἐθρόαντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας, altogether Hebrew in its hue. 25 Ἡμέρα, the day of the Lord, the day of terror, יוֹם הַהֲהָרָה, altogether in a Hebrew sense. 27 Πυρὸς ζῆλος, אֵשׁ הַחַרֹּן, exactly Hebrew. 29 Κοινόν, an unclean thing; see under 9: 13. 32 Ἀθλησιν . . . παθημάτων, a method of expression foreign to the classics. 35 Παρόρησιαν, confidence, Christian trust; classics, boldness or freedom of speech. Μισθαποδοσίαν, reward; sui generis.

XI. 3 Αἰῶνας, worlds, עוֹלָמֵי, entirely Jewish. Πήματι, command, אֲמַר, דְּבַר; Greek, saying, thing said. 5 Ἰδεῖν θάνατον, רָאָה מָוֶת, רָאָה שְׁחָתָה. Οὐχ εὐρίσκειτο, אֵינֶנּוּ; foreign to the classics. 6 Μισθαποδοτίης I cannot find in classic Greek. 7 Κόσμον, the ungodly, the world who were sinful: not of classic usage. Δικαιοσύνης, justifying, of justification: classics, equity, uprightness. 9 Συγκληρονόμων, joint-possessors; foreign, in this sense, to common Greek. 19 Ἐν παραβολῇ, peculiar method of expression. 34 Στόματα μαχαίρας, the edge of the sword, פִּי-הַחֶרֶב, unknown to the classic authors. 37 Ἐν γόνυ μαχαίρας, with the murderous sword, a Hebrew combination.

XII. 6 Παιδεύει, chastises, יָצַר, and ver. 7 παιδείαν, chastisement, מִצְוָה: the meanings here given to these two words, are seldom, if ever, given in the classics. 9 Τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας, a Hebrew, not a classic combination of ideas; σαρκὸς meaning the physical man, in distinction from the mental one. Τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, Heb. אֱלֹהֵי הַרוּחֹת לְכָל בָּשָׂר, Num. 16: 22. 27: 16; foreign to all the classics. 10 Ἀγιότητος, can hardly be found, I believe, in the classics. It is a Hellenistic term, corresponding to קִדְוּהָ. 11 Καρπὸν εἰρηνικόν, peaceful fruit, i. e. happy fruit, פְּרִי שָׁלוֹם; εἰρηνικόν here manifestly bearing the Hebrew-Greek, and not the classic sense. 14 Οὐδεὶς ὕψεται τὸν κύριον, so אֵין יָרָא לֹא יִהְיֶה, אֵין יָרָא אֶת-פְּנֵי יְהוָה, יִהְיֶה; the whole form of expression is

manifestly Hebraistic. 16 *Βρώσεως μιᾶς*, *one meal*; classics, the act of eating, or food. The certainty that *meal* is the idea here, arises from the adjunct *μιᾶς*. *Πρωτοτόκια*, Heb. פְּכִירָה; not used in the classics. 19 *Μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον*, עַד בְּלִתי יוֹסֵף עוֹד לְךָ דָבָר, a Hebrew and not a Greek mode of expression. 22 *Μυριάσι*, רַבּוֹ, רַבּוֹת, the usual Hebrew expression for a large indefinite number; the Latins said, *sexcenti*. 23 *Ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, כָּל הַקְּתוּבִים בְּהַרְוֵי, Is. 4: 3. Comp. Ex. 32: 32. Ps. 69: 28. Dan. 12: 1. Luke 10: 20, etc., an expression altogether Hebraistic.

XIII. 3 *Ὀντες ἐν σώματι*, *in a frail dying state*; not so expressed in the classics. The mode of expression comes from the Hebrew, בְּשָׂרָה. 7 *Ἑγουμένων*, *teachers, spiritual guides*, מְנַהֲגִים, מְנַהֲגָה; classic sense never that of *teachers*. 8 *Λθὲς καὶ σήμερον*, אַתְּמֹרָה וְיָדְהִיּוֹם; where, in all the classics is the like of this, in order to designate all past and present time? 15 *Θυσίαν ἀνέσεως . . . κάρπον χειλέων*; the idea of *sacrifice* of praise is Hebrew, Lev. 7: 12, זֶבַח הַתְּהִירָה, comp. Ps. 50: 14, 23. As to *κάρπον χειλέων*, there is nothing in the classics like it. Plainly it has its original in the Hebrew, קָרְבַּן שִׁפְתֵינוּ, קָרְבַּן שִׁפְתֵינוּ, Hos. 14: 3, *we will render to thee the calves* [i. e. the offerings, the fruit] *of our lips*, or rather, *we will render to thee calves with our lips*. 16 *Θυσίαις*, as applied to *εὐποΐας καὶ κοινονίας*, is purely a Hebrew application. 17 *Ἐπέρο τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν*, *for you*, לְבַנְיָשִׁיבָה; the Greeks, ὑπέρο ὑμῶν.

In this selection, I have aimed at taking only the more obvious words and phrases. It might be much enlarged, by more strenuously urging the principle, in all respects, of dissimilarity to the Greek classic writers. That an idea is *peculiar* to the Christian dispensation, and unknown to the classic authors, has not been the basis of my selection in any case, unless at the same time there is a phraseology, which is as foreign to the Greeks as the idea itself. If all the *ideas* which are not *classical*, were to be the guiding principal in our selection, there would be no end of examples. But this would not be a fair and proper method of proceeding. It is the *diction*, and *phraseology*, and the sense which is given to the words employed, that are asserted to be *Ἑλληνικώτερα*. In this shape have I endeavoured to meet the thing; and the reader has the result before him.

With such a result in view, what matters it, whether De

Wette, Schulz, Seyffarth, or even Origen himself, tells us that our epistle is almost *classical* Greek, and that all runs smoothly and oratorically on? As to this last assertion, I have only to ask, that those who make it would translate and explain, Heb. 2: 9, 10. 3: 3, 4, 15. 4: 3—9. 5: 5. 7—9. 6: 1, 2. 7: 1—3, 8, 9, 15, 16. 9: 9, 10, 15—17, 27, 28. 10: 5—9, 20. 11: 3, 39, 40. 12: 18—24, 27, 28. 13: 7—9, 11—13; to which I might easily add many other passages. If they will find Greek more elliptical, more involved, more intricate and dark, in all the epistles of Paul, I will thank them for the discovery.

I must add, also, that the list of Hebraisms and unclassical usage, in our epistle, would have been much more swelled, if I had not omitted to repeat the same words, so often as I found them repeated and used in a Hebraistic or unclassical manner. Such words are ἀδελφός, ἅγιος, ἀγιάζω, ἀμαρτία, ἀσθένεια, δικαίωμα, ἐγκαινίζω, ἐπαγγελία, καθ' ἡμέραν, κληρονόμος, κληρονομέω, κατάτασις, λόγος ἀρχῆς, μισθαποδοσία, μεγαλωσύνη, μεσίτης, νεκρός, οἶκος, οἶμα, τελεύω, and others.

I make the appeal now with boldness, and call upon those who assert the *almost classic* style and manner of our epistle, to produce more true Hebraisms, and more idioms foreign to the Greek classics, in any of Paul's acknowledged epistles. I will even venture to make another offer; which is, that I will shew that some at least of his acknowledged epistles exhibit less Hebrew colouring, when they shall have shewn that some of them exhibit more.

It does not signify to beat the air, in this contest. *Assertions* are one thing; *facts* are another. If Origen and all the Greek fathers were to assert, that our epistle is *Ἐλληνικώτερον* than Paul's, it could not make it so. "To the work of *examination*," would be my reply. Let every critic go to this work, for himself, if he knows enough of Hebrew idiom to do it; and the result will be an abiding conviction, that Origen had as little reason for the assertion in question, as he had for the adventurous remark which he has made, on the use of the Greek article by the sacred writers. Origen's assertion, and every other man's, on this subject, can be brought to the test; and he who subjects them to this pro-

cess, I am persuaded, will find himself brought, at last, if he will examine *impartially* and *fully*, to a firm conviction, that they are *mere* assertions, and nothing more.

§ 33. *Alexandrine hue of the epistle.*

Eichhorn, who has so strenuously insisted that Paul is not the author of our epistle, has endeavoured to show, that it is probably of Alexandrine origin. But the arguments which he adduces for this purpose, seem to me incapable of standing the test of a critical examination.

(1) 'The author of the epistle to the Hebrews, treats the ancient Jewish Scriptures as containing a mysterious and secret sense, concealed under the words. He also regards the various ritual observances of the ancient law, only as types and shadows of things under the Christian dispensation, Heb. 10: 1. 9: 8. Philo of Alexandria expresses the same views, *De confus. Lingg.* p. 348. Eichh. *Einleit.* p. 442.

That the general views of the author of our epistle in regard to the meaning and object of Jewish rites, coincided with those of Philo, I should not be at all disposed to deny. But who is going to shew us, that these were not founded in truth. If, as I believe, the Jewish dispensation had its origin in divine communications and directions, there can be no rational doubt that it had some important end in view. Surely now, the sacrifices and various rites of external purification, could never, in and of themselves, be deemed an object worthy of special divine interposition and command. Their connexion with some higher and more spiritual object and end, was what stamped their highest real value upon them. In any other point of view, they could scarcely be thought worthy of the character of him, who requires men to worship him in spirit and in truth.

That a man of such enlarged views as Philo, should have seen and felt this, and that Paul should have done the same, is not a matter of wonder to any one, who considers the tendency of an enlightened mind, to look on the *spiritual* design of religion as infinitely the most important and interesting part of it.

What can be more diverse, however, than the particular form which Philo gives to his speculations on this subject, and that in which the ideas of our author are developed? Philo allegorizes on every thing, and every where, almost without distinction. The historical facts in the book of Genesis, the connexion of Abraham with Sarah and Hagar, and all other occurrences related in the Pentateuch, are, if occasion presents an opportunity, converted into allegory, and made the theme of exuberant speculative mysticism. Neither is there one word in all, which has any relation to the Messiah, or to his atoning sacrifice.

How very different the types and shadows presented by our epistle are, the intelligent and critical reader need not be informed. All is brought to bear on one single point—the death of Christ, the propitiatory sacrifice for sin made by it, and the effectual reconciliation to God accomplished in this manner.

To reason, then, as Eichhorn has done, is just the same, as to bring forward the allegation, that Philo believed in the existence of one supreme God, that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews did the same, and then draw the inference, that the writer of this epistle must therefore have lived, or at least been nurtured, at Alexandria. I venture to say, that there never has been so rational an account of the *object* of the Jewish ritual, as the author of our epistle gives; nor one so worthy of the great Author of the old and the new dispensations, nor so consonant with the fundamental maxim, that ‘God is a spirit, and requires men to worship him in a spiritual manner.’

(2) ‘Philo intimates, that the higher mysteries of the Jewish religion are only for the initiated, *μύσταις*. In like manner our epistle, 5: 11—6: 3. Einleit. p. 444.’

I can find no trace of reserve in our epistle, in regard to the *ἀμύστοις*, or *uninitiated*. The expression of deep regret, that those whom the writer addresses had not made higher acquisitions of religious knowledge, I can easily find. Severe reproof for such negligence, I see; but not a word about any distinctions between *μύσται* and *ἀμύστοι*, *initiated* and *uninitiated*, am I able to discover. Philo, in respect to this, is more than half a

Grecian Platonist; but the writer of our epistle practises no concealment at all.

(3) 'The Alexandrine author of the book of Wisdom, has praised wisdom, on account of its nature and qualities, and then adduced historical examples to illustrate all this, *Wisd.* I—IX. 10: 1—16: 1. So the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, after urging and eulogizing faith, adduces historical examples of it, in chap. XI., in order more strongly to impress its importance, p. 445.'

To which one may reply, that from the days of the author of our epistle, down to the present time, almost every practical writer on religion, and every preacher on the subject of faith, has done the same. But does this prove, that every such writer and preacher was born or nurtured at Alexandria? Can a thing, so obvious to the common sense of all men as the appropriate method of treating a subject, be adduced to establish a special relation between any two men, as to country or education?

(4) 'Many thoughts and expressions, in the epistle to the Hebrews, resemble those of Philo, p. 446 seq.'

So Eichhorn, who has occupied several pages with detailing expressions which afford such resemblances. So Schulz, also, who has occupied fourteen pages with alleged parallels of this nature, printed in opposite columns. I have examined all these with attention, and must confess, that the impression made upon me by them, is very different from that which Eichhorn and Schulz appear to have received.

To any considerate man, who makes this examination, it will very naturally occur, that the author of our epistle and Philo were contemporaries. At least, the former must have come upon the stage, before the latter left it. Then, both were educated as Jews; both were deeply read in the Jewish Scriptures, above all in the law of Moses. Both thought, reasoned, and expressed themselves as Hebrews, writing in Greek. Both had the same views, fundamentally, of the great points of the religion of Moses. Both had high moral feelings, and a deep interest in them. Could it be possible, now, that there should not be points of resemblance between Philo and our author, when writing on similar

subjects? Surely not, any more than that there should not be points of similarity, between the sentiments of a Christian divine in any particular age and country, and those of another, near the same age, in a different country.

Both Philo and our author often appeal to the Jewish Scriptures. And because they deduce from them like sentiments, does this prove that our author must have been of the Alexandrine school? Why is not the argument just as good the other way, viz. to prove that Philo must have belonged to some other country, i. e. to that in which our author lived? All that such resemblance can prove, is, that both belonged to the *Mosaic school*; and who will deny this?

I may venture, however, to go farther, and to aver, that the *dissimilarity of style*, between our epistle and the works of Philo, as they appear in the copious extracts made by Schulz, is so great, that one might almost as well think of proving an alliance between some heathen writer of Greek and our epistle, as between the latter and Philo. The moment Philo departs from his Septuagint texts, he goes off to an idiom as different from that in our epistle, as can well be conceived of in a Hebrew, writing on moral subjects, and making the Old Testament the basis of his speculations. Every critical reader who inspects the parallels of Dr. Schulz can judge for himself of this; and to every such one the appeal is fearlessly made, in regard to the point in question.

The writers whom I am now controverting, are indebted to J. B. Carpzoff, (*Exercitt. Sac. in Paulli epist. ad Hebraeos, ex Philone Alexandrino, Helmst. 1750*), for the materials, which they have wrought up into the form of an argument for the Alexandrine origin of our epistle. But they do not once seem to have reflected, that if the same iron diligence, which Carpzoff has exhibited in his work, had been applied to the acknowledged epistles of Paul, in the same way, as large a harvest of resemblances might have been gathered. In regard to allegory, for example, (which is a main point of alleged resemblance), what could be more obvious, than to appeal to 1 Cor. 10: 1—6. 10: 11. Rom. 5: 14. 1 Cor. 15: 45—47. 2 Cor. 3: 13—18. Gal. 4: 22—31; also to Col. 2: 16, 17. Gal. 3: 23—25. 4: 1—5? May it not



be said of these passages (as Jerome says of our epistle, and which has been so often quoted with confidence), ‘*spirant quiddam Philonianum?*’ Let the experiment be made by another Carpzoff, and I venture to predict, that, assuming the principle of argument which is assumed by Eichhorn and Schulz, we may easily shew, that Paul himself must have been an Alexandrian, and been educated in the Philonian school.

One hint more, and I dismiss the subject. Is not the Septuagint Alexandrine Greek? Are not the Apocryphal books connected with the Old Testament, Alexandrine Greek? Does not the *whole* New Testament Greek bear a close resemblance, to the style of these two classes of books? Are not Paul’s epistles Hebrew-Greek, like all the rest? How can it be shewn, then, that the author of our epistle was an Alexandrian, because he writes Alexandrine Greek? If the argument be valid for this purpose, which Eichhorn and Schulz employ, then may we prove, that all the New Testament writers were Alexandrians. *Quod nimium facit, nihil facit.*

#### § 34. Result.

The conclusion, then, to be deduced, from the preceding examination, seems to be, that the arguments drawn from the style and diction of the epistle to the Hebrews, are not to be relied on as deciding the question against the Pauline origin of it. No case of this nature can be determined by *assertion*. Allegations made for such a purpose, if found to be contradicted by *facts*, are not to determine the manner in which the question before us is to be decided.

One other thing may be said with truth, which has an important bearing on this question. If the *internal* evidence is altogether insufficient to decide the point at issue in the negative, the *external* is equally so. Indeed, the *historical* evidence against the Pauline origin of our epistle is, as we have seen, so little, so vague, and for the most part so indirect, that we may well say, ‘the objections have never been of a *historical* nature, but of a

*conjectural* one.' They have arisen more from taste and feeling, than from tradition or testimony.

On the whole, I must acquiesce in the opinion of Origen, which I repeat as the general voice of antiquity ; IT IS NOT WITHOUT REASON THE ANCIENTS HAVE HANDED IT DOWN TO US THAT THIS EPISTLE IS PAUL'S. Nor should I differ materially from those, who, with Eusebius, can say, τοῦ δὲ Παύλου προόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες, *fourteen epistles are CLEARLY and CERTAINLY Paul's*. I consider, however, the form of the proposition, as stated by Origen, to be the most becoming, in regard to a point so controverted, and to contain, for substance, all which it is necessary or expedient for us to assert and to believe.

### § 35. Was Barnabas the Author ?

Whoever is satisfied with the arguments in favour of the Pauline origin of our epistle, may dispense with the examination, whether any other person than this apostle has a title to be considered as the author. But as past experience must lead one to believe, that unanimity in regard to this subject is not yet to be expected, but that some may still incline to adopt opinions about the authorship of our epistle, which were avowed or defended in ancient times ; it seems to be necessary, briefly at least, to examine the claims of some others, as well as those of Paul.

The doubts raised in ancient times, whether Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, occasioned conjectures with regard to several other persons. Among the remains of ancient Christian writings, we find some hints that Barnabas was the author of our epistle. We first meet with these, in the essay of Tertullian, de Pudicitia, c. 201. "Extat," says he, "enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos," i. e. *there is extant an epistle of Barnabas, inscribed to the Hebrews*. This is simple assertion, without any reference to the *reasons* why Tertullian supposes Barnabas to be the author. He does not intimate whether he gathers it from tradition, or assumes it as a matter of mere opinion. He speaks of it as a thing which he believes ; which seems to imply that others in that quarter of the church were probably of the same opin-

ion. But we find no mention of this opinion again, until so late as the end of the 4th century, when Jerome adverting to it says, "Most [of the Latins] believe, that the epistle to the Hebrews belongs to Barnabas, or Clement ;" see Berth. p. 2953, and Jerome in his Epist. ad Dardanum. Again, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, under the word *Paulus*, he says, "The epistle to the Hebrews is thought not to be his, on account of the discrepancy of the style ; but to belong to Barnabas, according to Tertullian ; or to the evangelist Luke, according to some ; or to Clement of Rome." The same thing Philastrius (A. D. 380) repeats, Haeres. c. 89. And in modern times Cameron and Schmidt have undertaken to defend the hypothesis, that Barnabas was the author of this epistle ; Bertholdt, ubi supra.

This is all the evidence which history gives us, in respect to this subject ; and this surely is too slender to build any opinion upon, which can lay claim to critical confidence.

But all hope of defending this opinion, with any degree of plausibility, is removed by a comparison of the epistle to the Hebrews with an epistle of Barnabas, still extant and undoubtedly the same that was extant in the days of Tertullian, as the quotations from it by the ancient Christian fathers evince. I produce here a few short extracts from this epistle, to enable every one to judge for himself, whether the author of the one epistle can be rationally supposed to have written the other.

Chap. IX. *Μάθετε οὖν, τέκνα, περὶ πάντων πλουσίως, ὅτι Ἀβραάμ, ὁ πρώτος περιτομῆν δοὺς, ἐν πνεύματι προσβλέψας εἰς τὸν υἱὸν περιέτεμε, λαβὼν τριῶν γραμμάτων ὄγκματα λέγει γὰρ· Καὶ περιέτεμεν Ἀβραάμ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἄνδρας δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ καὶ τριακοσίους. Τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ γνώσις ; Μάθετε τοὺς δεκαοκτώ πρώτους, εἶτα τοὺς τριακοσίους. Τὸ δὲ δέκα ὀκτώ, ἰῶτα δέκα, ἦτα ὀκτώ ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν. Ὅτι δὲ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ Ἰ ἐμέλλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν, λέγει καὶ, Τριακοσίους. Ἀηλοὶ οὖν τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τοῖς δυοῖ γραμμασι καὶ ἐν ἐνὶ, τὸν σταυρόν. Οἶδεν ὁ τὴν ἔμφυτον δωρεάν τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν. Οὐδεὶς γνησιώτερον ἔμαθεν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ λόγον· ἀλλὰ οἶδα ὅτι ἄξιτοι ἐστέ ἐμεῖς·*  
i. e. Children, learn abundantly in regard to all things ; for Abraham, who first instituted circumcision, practised this rite, looking forward in the Spirit to the Son, receiving the doctrine of the

three letters. For [the Scripture] says, And Abraham circumcised, of his household, three hundred and eighteen men. What instruction is imparted by this? Learn as to the first eighteen, then as to the three hundred. As to eighteen, *ἰῶτα* signifies ten, and *ἦτα* eight; this means *Jesus*. And because the cross, signified by *T*, would possess grace, it says, *three hundred*. It points out *Jesus*, therefore, by the two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this, who has conferred upon us the engrafted gift of his doctrine. No one has learned more genuine doctrine of me; but I know that ye are worthy of it." Cotelerius, Pat. Apostol. Tom. I. p. 28.

So then, because Abraham circumcised three hundred and eighteen persons, (which by the way is not said in the Scriptures, see Gen. 17: 23—27, comp. Gen. 14: 14, which gave occasion to the mistake), the system of gospel truth is disclosed in this mysterious number; and this because *ἰῶτα* stands for *ten*, *ἦτα* for *eight*, and *ταῦ* for *three hundred*, i. e. here is *Jesus*, and he crucified. Where in all the New Testament, is any thing like such egregious trifling as this?

See now, how the same Barnabas can explain the ceremony of the red heifer, the ashes of which were sprinkled upon offenders. After stating the ceremony, and that the ashes were sprinkled by three children, he thus proceeds. Ὁ μόσχος οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οἱ προσφερόντες, ἄνδρες ἁμαρτωλοὶ, οἱ προσενέγκαντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σφαγῆν· εἶτα οὐκέτι ἄνδρες, οὐκέτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ἡ ὁύσα. Οἱ δὲ ῥαντίζοντες παῖδες, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ἡμῖν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ τὸν ἀγνισμόν τῆς καρδίας, οἷς ἔδωκε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὴν ἐξουσίαν, (οὔσι δεκαδύο εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν γιλιῶν, ὅτι δεκαδύο αἱ φυλαὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ), εἰς τὸ κηρύσσειν. Διὰ τί δὲ τρεῖς παῖδες οἱ ῥαντίζοντες; Εἰς μαρτύριον Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὅτι οὗτοι μεγάλοι τῷ Θεῷ. Ὅτι δὲ τὸ ἔριον ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον; Ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ· διότι οἱ ἐλπίζοντες εἰς αὐτὸν ζήσονται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Διὰ τί δὲ τὸ ἔριον καὶ τὸν ὑσσωπόν; Ὅτι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἔσονται πορνηαὶ καὶ ῥήπαραι, ἐν αἷς ἡμεῖς σωθησόμεθα· ὅτι καὶ ἀλγῶν τὴν σάρκα δια τοῦ ῥύπου τοῦ ὑσσωπόν ἰάται. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτω γενόμενα, ἡμῖν μὲν ἔστι φανερά, ἐκείνοις δὲ σκοτεινά· ὅτι οὐκ ἤκουαν φωνῆς τοῦ κυρίου.

But enough. If all were cited, which betrays a feeble and

puerile mind, the whole epistle must be transcribed. Let him who needs further argument on this subject, peruse the whole epistle to the Hebrews, and then read through the epistle of Barnabas. It is impossible that he should not feel the almost indescribable difference between the two writers.

Here then is a case, where the possibility of mistake in judging is very small. The difference between this writer, and him who wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, in respect to style, precision, clearness, energy, brevity—in a word, every thing which characterises any writing—is heaven-wide. The most obtuse perception cannot fail to discern it. It is a hopeless case, to plead the cause of a hypothesis like this.

### § 36. *Was Luke the author?*

The first suggestion among the ancient fathers, that Luke had any part in the composition of the epistle to the Hebrews, is found in a fragment of Clement of Alexandria, preserved by Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* VI. 14, in which Clement asserts, that “Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue, and that Luke carefully translated it into the Greek.” See note p. 99. The same opinion or tradition, Origen mentions thus; “If I may give my opinion, I should say, the thoughts are the apostle’s; but the phraseology and composition belong to some one who relates what the apostle said, and as it were comments on the words of his master. But who wrote [i. e. wrote down] the epistle, God only knows. Report, which has come down to us, says, either that Clement of Rome wrote it, or that Luke the Evangelist did,” p. 104, *supra*.

Both Bertholdt and Eichhorn have adduced Origen as asserting, that report attributed the epistle to the Hebrews to Luke as the *real author*; which the context in Origen by no means allows. I cannot but understand him as saying merely, that ‘the ancients had a report, that either Luke, or Clement wrote down the epistle;’ which corresponds with the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, Origen’s teacher in early life. We have seen that afterwards, among the Latin churches, either Luke,

or Clement, was regarded as the real author of this epistle; for so the testimony of Jerome and Philastrius, cited in the preceding section, would seem to indicate.

We have no *historical* ground, then, on which we can build the opinion, that Luke was the author of this epistle. An uncertain tradition of the fourth century is surely insufficient. And even if Origen be understood as asserting, that tradition, in his day, assigned the composition of our epistle to Luke; he also asserts, at the same time, that traditionary testimony was at variance with itself, as one party assigned it to Clement of Rome. He evidently credits neither the one nor the other; at least, not in such a way as to be fully persuaded in his own mind; for he says, "Who wrote down the epistle, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν."

The same uncertainty both Jerome and Philastrius exhibit, in the testimony to which allusion has just been made.

It is no doubt true, that the style of Luke approximates much nearer to that of the epistle to the Hebrews, than the style of Barnabas; so that a comparison, in this respect, does not lead to so clear and satisfactory a result in this case, as in that. But the situation of Luke, (born and educated abroad, as he was, and never having resided long in Palestine), hardly leads one to believe, that he was so deeply versed in Rabbinical lore, and in Jewish feelings and modes of thinking, as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews must have been.

The main difficulty, however, is the *want* of any *external* evidence, that Luke was the author. And as there are, at least, no internal circumstances, or evidence from style, which speak much in favour of such an opinion, it must be abandoned as improbable, and altogether unsupported.

### § 37. *Was Clement of Rome the author?*

Origen is the first, who mentions Clement as the possible writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. In what sense he does this, has been already considered. Jerome and Philastrius, long afterwards, mention that some in the Latin churches attributed the epistle to the Hebrews to Clement of Rome. The evidence of

this from testimony, then, is not entitled to any degree of credit, sufficient to create serious doubts whether Clement may not have been the author.

The internal evidence, drawn from a comparison of the epistle to the Hebrews with Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians, by no means favours the supposition in question. Clement has often cited the epistle to the Hebrews. But this seems to me abundant proof, that he did not write that epistle himself; for as we have already seen, he appeals to it as Scripture, in order to establish and confirm sentiments which he is inculcating, and in the same manner as he does elsewhere to the other Scriptures. Is this to be supposed, in case he himself wrote that epistle? Did Clement attribute Scriptural authority to his own epistle? Or did the church, whom he addressed, attribute Scriptural authority to any epistles, but to those of an apostle? Does he any where in his letter, appeal to other epistles than such? The obvious answer to these inquiries determines the question, whether Clement wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, in the negative.

But further. The difficulty of style is so great, between the epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews, as to make it sufficiently evident, that both did not proceed from the same pen. I refer not merely to the choice of words, (although this might be easily shewn to be considerable), but to the general spirit and manner of the execution. There is an energy, originality, vividness of conception, and intensity of feeling, displayed every where in the epistle to the Hebrews, which is wholly wanting in Clement's epistle. It is plain, kind, faithful; but it is moderate, comparatively tame, made up of many extracts from the Old Testament and from Paul, and of imitations, as close as might be, of the latter. But what a wide difference there is, after all, between the original writer and the imitator, every one must feel who reads both. The one is a feeble rivulet, gliding gently along, which, but for the occasional contributions it receives from other streams, would become absorbed by the earth over which it passes, and cease to flow; the other a mighty stream, overflowing all its banks, supplying with water and fertilizing all the country through which it passes. It really seems to me, that

a man might as well mistake a canal on the banks of the Nile for the noble river itself, as mistake Clement for the author of the epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 38. *Was Apollos the author?*

A supposition never made by any of the ancient churches, and first ventured upon, I believe, by Luther, Com. in Gen. 48: 20. Postill. Ecc. Test. S. Johann. Evang. p. 44. But this opinion has since been applauded or defended by Le Clerc, Heumann, Müller, Ziegler, and Bertholdt, p. 2974.

The difficulties attending the supposition are, (1) We have no *external* evidence in favour of it; no voice of antiquity being raised to testify, that Apollos has left one single line of any written composition behind him, much less such an epistle as that to the Hebrews. (2) We have no *internal* evidence of such a fact; for there is no testimony of this nature in the epistle itself; and there can be no evidence drawn from the style of it compared with the style and diction of Apollos, inasmuch as we have no writing of Apollos, with which the comparison can be made. It follows, therefore, that those who believe Apollos to be the author, must believe so without any evidence external or internal. It is not worth our time to refute such a belief.

§ 39. *In what language was the epistle originally written?*

On this question, there has been a difference of opinion among critics, both in ancient and modern times. Clement of Alexandria says that "Paul wrote to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and that Luke carefully translated it into Greek, Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VI. 14." Eusebius in the same manner says, that 'Paul wrote to the Hebrews in his vernacular language, and that, according to report, either Luke or Clement translated it, Euseb. III. 28.' So Jerome also; "Scripserat ut Hebraeus Hebraeis Hebraice, (Catal. vir. illust. voc. Paulus);" and then he adds, that 'this epistle was translated into Greek, so that the colouring of the style was made diverse, in this way, from that of Paul's.' Of



the same opinion, in respect to this, was Clement of Alexandria ; and Origen as we have seen above, supposes that the *thoughts* contained in the epistle were Paul's, while the *diction* or *costume* of it must be attributed to the person, who wrote down the sentiments of the apostle.

By the *Hebrew language*, no one can reasonably doubt, these fathers meant the *Jerusalem dialect*, which was spoken in the days of the apostles, and not the ancient Hebrew, which had long ceased to be a vernacular language.

It is quite plain also, that these fathers were led to the conclusion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in the dialect of Palestine, from their belief, (so universal in ancient times), of its having been addressed to some church, or to the churches, in that country. It was very natural to draw such a conclusion ; for would not an epistle addressed to Hebrews in all probability be more acceptable, if written in their own vernacular language ? Moreover, Paul was well acquainted with that language, for he was brought up at Jerusalem and "at the feet of Gamaliel ;" and when he had visited there, he had addressed the Jewish multitude, who were excited against him, in their native tongue, Acts 22: 1, 2. Why should it not be supposed, that if, (as is probable), our epistle was originally directed to Palestine, it was written in the dialect of that country ?

So the fathers above quoted evidently thought and reasoned ; although other fathers have said nothing on this point, and do not appear to have coincided in opinion with those to which I have just referred. Among the moderns, also, several critics have undertaken to defend the same opinion ; and particularly Michaelis, who has discussed the subject quite at length, in his introduction to this epistle.

I do not think it necessary minutely to examine his arguments. To my own mind they appear altogether unsatisfactory. Some of them are built on an exegesis most palpably croneous, and which, if admitted, would deduce a very strange meaning from the words of the epistle. Yet, assuming such a meaning, he thence concludes, that the *original* writer must have expressed a different idea, and that the *translutor* mistook his meaning. He

then undertakes to conjecture, what the original Hebrew must have been. In other cases, he deduces his arguments from considerations wholly *a priori*; as if these were admissible, in a question of mere *fact*. He has not adduced a single instance of what he calls *wrong translation*, which wears the appearance of any considerable probability.

On the other hand, Bolten, a sharp-sighted critic, and well acquainted with the Aramean language, (who has gone through with the New Testament, and found almost every where marks, as he thinks, of translation from Aramean documents), confesses, that in respect to this epistle, he finds not a single vestige of incorrect translation from an Aramean original, and *no marks that there ever was such an original*. This testimony is of considerable importance in respect to the question before us; as it comes from a critic, who spent many years on the study of that which is most intimately connected with the very subject under consideration, viz. the detection of the Aramean originals of the various parts of the New Testament. Berth. p. 2976.

The principal *arguments* in favour of a Hebrew original, are deduced from two sources. First, that *Hebrews* are addressed in our epistle; to whom the Hebrew language would have been more acceptable and intelligible, and many of whom, indeed, could not understand Greek, certainly could not read it. Secondly, that the diversity of style in the epistle to the Hebrews is so great, when compared with that of Paul's epistles, that, unless we suppose the Greek costume did in fact come from another hand, we must be led to the conclusion, that Paul did not write it.

Both of these topics have been already discussed above. I merely add here, therefore, that in case the writer of the epistle designed it should have a wide circulation among the Jews, to write in Greek was altogether the most feasible method of accomplishing this. Besides, if Paul did address it to the church at Cesarea, it is altogether probable that he wrote in Greek, as Greek was the principal language of that city. Even if he did not, it was not necessary that he should write in Hebrew; for in every considerable place in Palestine, there were more or less who understood the Greek language. Whoever wishes to see this

last position established beyond any reasonable doubt, may read Hug's *Einleit. in das N. Test. Band. II. § 10.*

When Paul wrote to the *Romans*, he did not write in *Latin*; yet there was no difficulty in making his epistle understood, for the knowledge of Greek was very common at Rome. If Paul understood the Latin language, (which is no where affirmed, and he had not resided, when he wrote our epistle, in any of the countries where it was commonly used), still he understood Greek so much better, that he would of course prefer writing in it.

For a similar reason, if no other could be given, one may regard it as more probable, that he would write the epistle to the Hebrews in the Greek language. At the time of writing it, he had been abroad twenty five years at least, in Greek countries, and had been in Palestine, during all that period, only a few days. The Jews abroad, whom he every where saw, spoke *Greek*, not Hebrew. In Greek he preached and conversed. Is it any wonder, then, that after twenty five years incessant labour of preaching, conversing, and writing in this language, he should have preferred writing in it? Indeed can it be probable, that, under circumstances like these, he still possessed an equal facility of writing in his native dialect of Palestine?

I cannot think it strange, therefore, that although the epistle to the Hebrews was in all probability directed to some part of Palestine, yet it was written by Paul in Greek, and not in Hebrew. But, whatever may be the estimation put upon arguments of this nature, there are *internal marks* of its having been originally composed in Greek, which cannot well be overlooked. Let us examine them.

Some of the arguments, produced by those who maintain that the original language of our epistle was Greek, it must be acknowledged, do not seem to be well founded. To such belongs the following.

‘Instances of paronomasia occur in this epistle; which necessarily implies, that it was originally composed in its present language.’

For example; Heb. 5: 8, ἔμαθε ἐν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε. 5: 14, πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ. 7: 3, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ.

9: 10, ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι. 11: 37, ἐπρίσθησαν, ἐπειράσθησαν. 13: 14, οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν. 7: 22, κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος ἰησοῦς, comp. v. 19, ἐγγίξομεν τῷ θεῷ. 10: 34, τὴν ἀπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὑπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς. See Eich. § 270. Bertholdt, p. 2987, who has only repeated the same things which Eichhorn had before said.

Of these instances, that only from 10: 34 seems to betray any real marks of *design*; and even here, the marks are by no means of a decisive nature. Every one, who will examine any Greek writing whatever, may find in it more or less of apparent paronomasia in the same way, without any difficulty; and this, where the author had no intention of exhibiting it. Whether an author really *designed* to exhibit paronomasia, or not, will in general be very apparent. I cannot perceive, that any one of the alleged paronomasias in question, really appears to be the effect of design. If they are altogether accidental, they may have occurred in the epistle to the Hebrews, even if its present language is merely that of a *translation*. In fact, even designed paronomasias may, not unfrequently, occur in a translation. The argument in favour of the Greek being the original language of the epistle to the Hebrews, built on such instances of paronomasia as the above, (where, in most cases, it is a mere homophony of like tenses or cases), is too uncertain and too slender to be rested on, as a proper support of the opinion in question.

But there are better arguments than such, to prove that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Greek. They may be derived, from the manner in which the quotations from the Old Testament are made and employed, in our epistle.

(1.) The author has, throughout, quoted the Sept. version, and followed it in nearly all cases, even where it differs considerably from the Hebrew. This, indeed, might be done to a certain extent, by a translator. For example; if Paul had appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures, and cited passages from them, the translator might have taken the corresponding passages in his Greek Bible. It might easily be supposed, that it would have

been very natural for him to do so, in all cases where there was no considerable difference between the original Hebrew and the Greek version. But,

(2.) The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has cited and employed the Sept. version, in order to illustrate his positions, in cases where the Septuagint does not correspond with the original Hebrew. For example; Heb. 1. 6, *Let all the angels of God worship him*, is quoted, in order to show that the Son of God is superior to the angels. If this be quoted, (as is more generally supposed), from Ps. 97: 7, the context there appears to shew, that the subject is, *the superiority of Jehovah to idol-gods*, not of Christ to the angels. Instead of "Let all the angels of God worship him," the Hebrew runs thus, "Worship him all ye gods;" and so our English translation has it. If the quotation be made from Deut. 32: 43, (as some have supposed), then is the argument still stronger; for in the original Hebrew there is not a vestige of the passage quoted; it is found only in the Septuagint. In either case, the force of the appeal seems to rest on the Sept. version, and not on the original Hebrew. Of course, the writer must be supposed to have used that version, in his original composition, by all those who hold that he appeals, in this case, to a passage of the Old Testament.

But, as I have some doubts whether such an appeal is here made by the apostle, of course I cannot attribute much weight to this argument. See Comm. on Heb. 1: 6.

(3.) The writer appeals, in Chap. 11., to Ps. viii., in order to prove that the Son of God must possess a human nature, which should be exalted above that of angels, and placed at the head of the creation. But the phrase in Hebrew, *Thou hast made him a little below the Elohim*, is rendered by the Septuagint, *Thou hast made him for a little time, [or, a little] lower than the angels*; rendering אֱלֹהִים *angels*, which, to say the least, is an unusual sense of the word. Yet, on the sense of the version in the Septuagint, turns the force of this proof, that Christ was, in his human nature, superior to the angels.

(4.) In chap. vii., the writer has translated the appellations, *Melchisedek, king of Salem*, and told at length what they mean in

Greek. It is possible, that such a thing might be done by a translator ; but then the explanation, in this case, appears plainly to be interwoven with the discourse itself, and to be *a prima manu*.

(5.) In chap. 9: 16, 17, Christ is said, in reference to the *old* covenant under Moses, to be the mediator of a *new* and *better* covenant, בְּרִית, in Greek διαθήκη. But, from the double meaning of διαθήκη in Greek, viz. *covenant* and *testament*, the writer takes occasion, having mentioned the death of Jesus, to observe, that the new διαθήκη has received its full confirmation, viz. as a *testament*, by the death of the testator ; and that he may the more effectually remove all offence at the death of Jesus, he goes on to say, that a διαθήκη i. e. *testament*, (for now he uses the word in this sense), *has no force while the testator is living*. Of course, the death of Jesus was necessary to ratify the *new* διαθήκη ; and it did in fact ratify and establish it, to all intents and purposes.

Now the whole of this reasoning depends on the two-fold sense of the word διαθήκη, in Greek ; for the original word בְּרִית, in Hebrew, never has the sense of *testament* or *will*.

The Greek word διαθήκη has, indeed, been adopted into the Rabbinic Hebrew, and sounds בְּרִיתָּהּ. But that it belonged to the Hebrew language, in Paul's day, there is no certain proof ; and even if there were, בְּרִית must have been the only word to which he referred, for בְּרִית is an appropriate word to designate the Abrahamic and Mosaic dispensations, or the old covenant. Of course, the writer's illustration depends on the two-fold meaning of the *Greek* word διαθήκη ; consequently, his language must have been Greek.

(6.) In chap. 10: 3 seq. the writer undertakes to show, that the sacrifice of Christ was not only necessary, in order to make expiation for sin, but that it was predicted in the Psalms, that he should make such an offering. In proof of this, he quotes the Septuagint version, *A body hast thou prepared for me*, 10: 54, viz. a body for an offering or expiatory sacrifice. Compare now Ps. 11: 7, where the Hebrew runs thus, מִן־עָרְבָה לְאָזְנוֹתַי, *mine ears hast thou opened* or *bored*, i. e. thou hast made me obedi-

ent. But it is the Septuagint version which appears to give direct occasion for the specific allegation, of the writer, viz. that Christ had made an offering of himself as a propitiatory sacrifice.

Other instances of a similar nature have been produced by critics, from our epistle ; but as they are less striking, and may admit of some doubt, I have thought best to exclude them. These are sufficient to shew, that as the very nature of the proof or argument, which the writer brings forward, depends, in some respects, on the form of the Septuagint version, or to say the least, the *form* of the proof depends on this, so he must have written in Greek, and appealed to the Greek version ; for it is improbable to the last degree, that if the epistle had been written in Hebrew, he would have appealed to any but the original Hebrew Scriptures, when addressing those who were acquainted with them.

Whatever difficulties the theologian or the interpreter may find, in reconciling these facts with the method of arguing which he may suppose appropriate to an inspired writer, it cannot alter the *facts themselves*. These are palpable, and not matters of conjecture. And admitting this, we are compelled to draw the conclusion, that **THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF OUR EPISTLE MUST HAVE BEEN GREEK.**

I would add merely, that the vivid colouring and animation of the whole epistle, the impassioned and energetic expression of it, and its native, unconstrained appearance, all contribute to prove, that it was originally written in the same language in which it now appears.

#### § 40. *Critical and exegetical helps to the study of the epistle.*

It is not my object to make out a copious catalogue of these ; but only to notice those which are more particularly deserving of attention.

##### Ancient Greek Commentators.

Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, the Greek commentators on this epistle, are all deserving of an attentive perusal,

in various respects. Philological, (in the technical sense of this word), the reader must not expect to find them. Chrysostom is the most copious, flowing, and oratorical; Theodoret, the most brief and comprehensive; but Theophylact is by far the most agreeable, especially for beginners in the study of Greek commentary. He comprises all that is valuable in Chrysostom, and, for the most part, nearly in Chrysostom's words; while, at the same time, he has given to the whole, more ease, simplicity, and compactness. Seldom does he venture upon any new opinion of his own, and when he does, it is with great deference to his predecessors. The book deserves a republication at the present day, as a part of the apparatus requisite to the study of our epistle, and as one of the easiest and best means, of introducing the young interpreter to an acquaintance with the Greek Commentators.

If a glossary should be added to such a book, containing the few words in Theophylact that are not found in our common Greek lexicons, and also the very good Latin translation which now accompanies the Greek of Theophylact, it would constitute an excellent book, for commencing the study and the knowledge of the original Greek fathers. Such an apparatus is already prepared, and the book only waits for patronage, in order to be published.

English Commentators.

*Owen*, Exposition of the epistle to the Hebrews, with preliminary Exercitations, 7 vols. Svo. Edinb. 1812—14.—This work is replete with remarks of a doctrinal and experimental nature. The philology of it will be less valued, at the present day.

*J. Pierce*, Paraphrase and Notes on the epistles of Paul, 4to. Lond. 1733.—Some of the sentiments differ widely from those of Owen, and are such as ought to be examined with great caution; but the work, as a whole, exceeds any English commentary which I have read. The author has a great deal of acuteness, and is by no means wanting in regard to a tact for criticism.

The works of Sykes, Whitby, Doddridge, Macknight, Scott, Clark, and others, on this epistle, may profit some classes of readers, but they are not adapted to the higher purposes of philology.



## Commentaries in Latin and German.

Among the older commentators, Erasmus, Grotius, Le Clerc, Drusius, J. Cappell, Limborch, and Wolfius, have distinguished themselves. The more recent works are the following.

*J. B. Carpzovius*, Exercitt. in Pauli epist. ad Hebraeos, ex Philone Alexandrino, 8vo. Helmst. 1750.—The same author has also published, Uebersetzung des Briefs an die Hebräer, Helmst. 1795.

*J. A. Cramer*, Erklärung des Briefs an die Hebräer, 4to. Kopenhagen, 1757.

*C. F. Schmidius*, Observatt. super epist. ad Hebraeos, histor. crit. et theologicae, 8vo. Lips. 1766.

*J. D. Michaelis*, Erklärung des Briefs an die Hebräer, 4to. 2 edit. 1780.

*S. F. N. Morus*, Der Brief an die Hebräer uebersetzt, 8vo. Leipz. 1786.

*G. C. Storr*, Pauli Brief an die Hebräer erläutert. 8vo. Tübingen, 1809.

*J. A. Ernesti*, Lectiones in epist. ad Hebraeos; illustrationes adjecit *G. J. Dindorf*, 8vo. Lips. 1795;—a book of real worth, in a critical respect, although not executed with much taste as to form and manner. I have found in it more to my purpose, than in any other of the commentaries which I have consulted.

*Heinrichs*, in Nov. Test. Koppiano, Vol. viii.—This is a work, which exhibits some striking remarks, and no inconsiderable tact for exegesis. But the occasional extravagance of this writer's opinions, and the haste with which he throws off his works, are to be regretted; as he plainly possesses ability to go deeper into his subjects of inquiry.

*D. Schulz*, Der Brief an die Hebräer, Einleitung, Uebersetzung, und Anmerkungen, 8vo. Breslau, 1818.

The latest work is by *C. F. Boehme*, Epist. ad Heb. Latine vertit, atque commentario instruxit perpetuo. 8vo. Lips. 1825. See above, § 31.

*Literature of the epistle.*

The introductions of Michaelis, Haenlein, Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, and De Wette, exhibit the sum of what has been hitherto accomplished, in regard to this subject. Seyffarth and Schulz, in the works examined above, have also discussed the same subject; as have Ziegler, Noesselt, Weber, Lardner, and others. Wolfius, Storr, Schmidt, Cramer, and most other commentators, have touched, more or less, on the literary topics that pertain to the epistle. Lardner, Storr, Ziegler, Cramer, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, and Schulz, are most conspicuous among the class of writers now under consideration.

END OF VOLUME 1.

# INDEX

TO

## COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

### VOL. I.

- APOLLOS**; was he the author of our epistle? 278.
- AUGUSTINE**; his testimony, 129.
- BARNABAS**; has passages resembling our epistle, 37. Was he the author of it? 272 seq.
- BERGER**; maintains our epistle to be a homily, 4 seq.
- BERTHOLDT**; his remarks on the testimony of Pautenus, 94 seq.; remarks on the testimony of Clemens Alex., 100 seq.; his objections to Eusebius' testimony, 116 seq.; remarks on internal evidence of our epistle, that Paul was its author, 137; Objections against the opinion, that Paul was the author of our epistle, 174 seq.
- BOEHME**; his objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle, 258 seq.
- BOLTEN**; his opinion, that the epistle was written to the dispersed Jewish Christians in Asia Minor examined, 31 seq.
- CAIUS**; his testimony, 121 seq.
- CARPZOFF**; sense which he attributes to the word, *Hebrews*, 45.
- CESAREA**; was our epistle directed to the church there? 68 seq.
- CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA**; his testimony respecting our epistle, 98 seq.
- CLEMENT OF ROME**; quotes our epistle, 75 seq.; Testimony, *ibid.* Was he the author of it? 276 seq.
- COMMENTATORS**; on our epistle, 237 seq.
- CORINTHIANS**; first epistle to, compared, as to peculiarities, with the epistle to the Hebrews, 241 seq.
- CYPRIAN**; his testimony, 125.
- DE WETTE**; his objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle, examined, 253 seq.
- EBIONITES**; did not admit our epistle; reason why, 64 seq.
- EICHHORN**; sense which he attributes to the word, *Hebrews*, examined, 44 seq.; his objection to the opinion, that the epistle was written to the church in Palestine, examined, 58 seq.; remarks on the testimony of Pautenus, 94; remarks on the testimony of Clemens Alex., 99 seq.; his objections to Eusebius' testimony, 116 seq.; remarks on internal evidence, 139 seq.; opinion about the Alexandrine origin and hue of epistle, examined, 267 seq.
- EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS**; early division of opinion about the author of it, 1 seq.; question whether it is an epistle or a homily, 4 seq.; to what church written? 9 seq.; addressed to those who had an intimate knowledge of the Jewish rites, etc., 48 seq.; objections against the supposition, that it was written to the church in Palestine, examined, 54 seq.; author, 90 seq. In what language was it originally written, 279.
- EUSEBIUS OF CESAREA**; his testimony respecting our epistle, 113 seq.
- EVIDENCE**; *internal*, that Paul wrote our epistle, 132 seq.; from Heb. 13: 23. p. 132; from Heb. 13: 18, 19. p. 135; from Heb. 13: 24. p. 139.
- , *internal*, from the sentiment, form, method, style, and diction, 141 seq.—from the sen-

- timent, 148 seq.;—from the form and method, 152 seq.;—from the diction, 160 seq.
- HEBRAISMS**; of our epistle, exhibited, 260 seq.
- HEBREWS**; meaning of the word as used in the inscription of the epistle, 8 seq. particularly, 42 seq.
- HERMAS**; has a passage resembling our epistle, 37.
- IGNATIUS**; has passages resembling our epistle, 88.
- IRENAEUS**; his testimony respecting our epistle, 119 seq.
- JEROME**; his testimony, 127 seq.
- JEWS**; those who lived abroad, did not much frequent the worship of the temple etc., 46 seq.; were not so zealous as the Palestine Jews, about Levitical rites, 48 seq.
- JUSTIN MARTYR**; quotes our epistle, 88 seq.
- LARDNER**; some insufficient arguments of his, to prove that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, examined, 38 seq.
- LUDWIG**; conjecture about the direction of our epistle, examined, 37.
- LUKE**; was he the author of our epistle? 275.
- MICHAELIS**; some insufficient arguments of his, to prove that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, examined, 38 seq.
- MURATORIUS**; testimony of an ancient anonymous writer, respecting the N. Test. Canon, contained in his *Antiqq. Ital.*, 122 seq.
- NOESSELT**; his opinion, that the epistle was written to the church at Thessalonica, examined, 25 seq.
- NOVATUS**; his testimony, 125 seq.
- OBJECTIONS**; against the opinion that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, examined, 54 seq.
- Various objections by Eichhorn, 58 seq., 94, 99 seq., 116 seq., 139 seq.
- By Bertholdt, 94 seq., 100 seq., 116 seq., 137.
- Against the opinion that Paul was the author of our epistle; by Bertholdt, 174 seq.; by Schulz, 194 seq.; by Seyffarth, 232 seq.
- nature of, examined, 241.
- by De Wette, examined, 253.
- by Boehme, 258.
- ORIGEN**; his testimony respecting our epistle, 104 seq., 109 seq.
- PANTENUS OF ALEXANDRIA**; his testimony respecting our epistle, 92 seq.
- POLYCARP**; has passages resembling our epistle, 87 seq.
- RESULT**; viz. of the examination of objections, made against the opinion that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine, 67; of the examination of testimony, respecting the author of our epistle, 129;—of the examination of objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle, 271 seq.
- SCHULZ**; various objections against the opinion, that Paul was the author of our epistle, 194 seq.—objections from *words* and *phrases* used in our epistle, 218 seq.;—from words employed in a peculiar sense, 224 seq.;—from favourite expressions, 225.
- SEYFFARTH**; his objections against the Pauline origin of our epistle examined, 232 seq.—objections from the peculiarity of the matters treated of, 232 seq.;—from peculiar forms and juncture of words, 235;—from words employed in a sense *sui generis*, 237;—from *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*, 239.
- STORR**; his opinion that the epistle was written to the church in Galatia, examined, 10 seq.
- TERTULLIAN**; his testimony, 123.
- TESTIMONIES**; viz. respecting the origin of our epistle, by various Christian fathers, 112, 126.
- TIMOTHY**; his connexion with Paul, and his being *ἀπολειψόμενος*, 63.
- WEBER**; his opinion, that the epistle was addressed to the church at Corinth, examined, 32 seq.
- WETSTEIN**; conjecture about the direction of our epistle, examined, 37.







BS2775.S932 v.1  
Commentary on the Epistle to the

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00070 9388